DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 608 IR 006 027

AUTHOR Perritt, Lea J., Ed.; Mertens; Donna M., Ed.
TITLE Summative Evaluation of Workshops. Summer, 1977.
INSTITUTION Appalachian Regional Commission, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 105p.; For related documents, see ED 125 594-595, ED 146 908, ED 148 312, and IR 006 650

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Satellites; Information Dissemination; *Instructional Design; Instructional Innovation; *Participant Characteristics; Program Evaluation; Seminars; *Summative Evaluation; Videotape Recordings; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Appalachian Education Satellite Project

ABSTRACT

A series of nine workshops delivered via satellite under the Appalachian Education Satellite Project (AESP) during the summer of 1977 was evaluated in terms of participant characteristics and workshop effectiveness. Workshop topics included special education, child abuse, diagnostic and prescriptive reading instruction, cardiovascular physical assessment, and home energy conservation. Similar formats for all of the workshops included delivery of videotaped materials, interactive seminars, distribution of printed materials, and completion of evaluation instruments. Results indicated that workshops presented via satellite are generally an effective way to deliver needed series on topics of interest. (CHV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162608

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

SUMMER, 1977

Prepared by

Lea J. Perritt

and

Donna M. Mertens

December, 1977

IR006027

The Technical Report Series of the Appalachian Education Satellite Project is edited and published by the RCC Evaluation Component at the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

The purpose of this series is to document and disseminate information about the design, implementation and results of the AESP experiment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

AESP-ARC Personnel

Harold Morse, Director of AESP
Dennis Goldstein, Associate Director of AESP
Robert Shuman, Deputy Director of AESP
James Freeman, Chief Engineer
Jerry Goerz, Engineer
Dave Buckingham, Regional Site Coordinator
Gail Schlenker, Regional Site Coordinator

AESP-RCC Personnel

Nofflet Williams, Director of RCC
Cathy Hensley, Coordinator of Field Services
Donna Mertens, Coordinator of Evaluation
Jody Fitzpatrick, Research Associate
Lea Perritt, Evaluator
Melissa Etlin, Materials Developer
Danlo Kao, Data Analyst
Lloyd Lowry, Data Analyst
Rosemary Waters, Senior Administrative Assistant
Debby Kahoe, Clerical Assistant
Gayle Abegglen, Field Services Secretary
Marianne Truong, Evaluation Secretary
Roger Koonce, Associate Director for Instructional Design and Production
Rick Falknor, Assistant Media Services Coordinator
Britt Davis, Producer-Director
Paul LeVeque, Producer-Director
Jerry McDonald, Producer-Director

AESP Cluster Directors

Jerry Ayers, Tennessee
Alice Beckman, New York and Tennessee
Douglas Cross, Tennessee
Alan Hyatt, Alabama
Morley Jones, Virginia and North Carolina
Frank Peto, Maryland - West Virginia and Pennsylvania
Don Smith, Alabama and Georgia
Rick Williamson, West Virginia and Pennsylvania
Kathryn Zachary, North Carolina and Georgia

In addition, special thanks are extended to the following persons for their assistance in the development and implementation of the special education workshops. These persons, listed in alphabetical order, are:

Lois Adams, Marge Allen, Edward Blackhurst, Elizabeth Churchill, Misha Phillips, Alan Siegel, Ray Simches, Lynette Uhl, and Bettye Warren.

TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES

1. AESP Data Base Information: Rationale, Data Collection Procedure, Interpretation of Results. Prepared by William J. Bramble, Claudine Ausness, Larry Harding and Robert Wetter. Winter 1973

2. An Experiment in Educational Technology: An Overview of the Appalachian Education Satellite Project. Prepared by Claudine Ausness and Betty Bowling. March, 1974.

3. Formative Evaluation Study for AESP Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Courses. Prepared by William J. Bramble, Claudine Ausness and Robert Wetter. October, 1974.

4. The Evaluation Design: Summer Courses, 1974. Prepared by William J. Bramble, Claudine Ausness, Robert Wetter and Larry Harding. December, 1974.

5. Performance of AESP Transmission/Reception Equipment (Summer and Fall, 1974). Prepared by William J. Bramble, Claudine Ausness and James R. Freeman. July, 1975.

6. Student Ratings of Instructional Activities: Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction, Summer, 1974. Prepared by Rodger Marion, William J. Bramble, Robert Wetter and Cathy Whitton, July, 1975.

7. Student Ratings of Instructional Activities: Career Education in the Elementary Grades, Summer, 1974. Prepared by Larry Harding, William J. Bramble and Rodger Marion. August, 1975.

8. Student Achievement: Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction Course, Summer, 1974. Prepared by Rodger Marion, William J. Bramble and Claudine Ausness. August, 1975.

9. Student Achievement: Career Education in the Elementary Grades, Summer, 1974. Prepared by Rodger Marion, William J. Bramble and Claudine Ausness. August, 1975.

10. Cost Estimation Model for Alternative Course Formats and Delivery Modes. Prepared by William J. Bramble, Claudine Ausness, and Donna Mertens. September, 1975.

11. Summative Evaluation of Career Education in the Secondary School Course, Fall, 1974. Prepared by Diane Maynard, Rodger Marion and William J. Bramble. September, 1975.

12. Summative Evaluation of Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction K-6 Course, Spring, 1975. Prepared by William J. Bramble, Diane Maynard and Rodger Marion. September, 1975.

TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES

13. Review of the Literature: Appalachian Needs in Five Programming Areas. Prepared by Donna M. Mertens and William J. Bramble. June, 1976.

14. Results of Appalachian Needs Assessment Conferences. Prepared by Donna M. Mertens and William J. Bramble. June, 1976.

15. DPRI and CES Follow-Up Studies. Prepared by Jody L. Fitzpatrick and Donna M. Mertens. July 1977.

16. Development, Delivery and Evaluation of AESP's Visual Learning Course. Prepared by Donna M. Mertens. August 1977.

17. Summative Evaluation of Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction K-6 Course, Spring, 1977, and Career Education in the Elementary School Course, Summer, 1977. Prepared by Lea J.Perritt and Donna M. Mertens. November, 1977.

18. Summative Evaluation of Workshops, Summer, 1977. Prepared by Lea J. Perritt and Donna M. Mertens. December 1977.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES ii

INTRODUCTION 1

WORKSHOP REPORTS

Special Education: "The Role of the Placement Committee in Developing Individual Education Plans for Handicapped Children" by Donna M. Mertens 4

Special Education: "Issues in the Education of the Handicapped" by Jody L. Fitzpatrick 25

Child Abuse: "Initial Issues in Child Abuse" and "Some Perspectives on Treatment" by Lea J. Perritt 39

Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction: "Follow-Up" by Lea J. Perritt 52

Cardiovascular Physical Assessment: "Overview" and "Heart Sounds, Pressures, and Pulses" by Lea J. Perritt 63

Home Energy Conservation: "Part I" and "Part II" by Lea J. Perritt 84

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 95

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Schedule of Workshops Delivered During Summer 1977	3
	Special Education Workshop I	
2	Frequency of Participants by Site	8
3	Background Characteristics of the Participants	9
4	Site Monitor's Ratings of Equipment Functioning	16
5	Rank Ordering of Topics of Interest for Future Programs by AESP Participants	18
6	Rank Ordering of Topics of Interest for Future Programs by Lexington Participants	20
7	Rank Ordering of Topics of Interest for Future Programs by Greenbelt Participants	22
	Special Education Workshop II	
8	Frequency of Participants by Site	28
9	Participant's Position During 1976-1977 Academic Year	29
10	Site Monitor's Ratings of Equipment Functioning	37
	Child Abuse Workshops	
11	Frequency of Participants by Site and Session	43
12	Background Characteristics of the Participants by Session	44
13	Site Monitor's Ratings of ATS-6 System	48
	DPRI Workshop	
14	Frequency of Participants by Site	54
15	Background Characteristics of the Participants	55
16	Site Monitor's Ratings of Equipment Functioning	58
17	Rank Ordering of Topics of Interest for Future Programs	60

LIST OF TABLES -- CONTINUED

Table		Page
18	Rank Ordering of Interest in Reading Experts as Panelists for Future Programs	61
19	Rank Ordering of Experts in Reading by Percentage of Participants not Familiar with Them	61
	Cardiovascular Physical Assessment Workshops	
20	Frequency by Participants by Site and Session	66
21	Background Characteristics of the Participants by Session	67
22	Site Monitor's Ratings of ATS-6 System	75
23	Rank Ordering of Topics of Interest for Future Programs Workshop I	77
24	Rank Ordering of Topics of Interest for Future Programs Workshop II	79
25	Rank Ordering of Topics of Interest for Future Programs by Medical Speciality - Workshop I	81
26	Rank Ordering of Topics of Interest for Future Programs by Medical Speciality - Workshop II	81
27	Rank Ordering of Topics of Interest for Future Programs by Patient Group	82
	Home Energy Conservation Workshops	
28	Frequency of Participants by Site and Session	87
29	Background Characteristics of the Participants by Session	88
30	Site Monitor's Ratings of Equipment Functioning of ATS-6 System	93

INTRODUCTION

In 1971 the Appalachian Education Satellite Project (AESP) was established. The project was originally designed to determine the feasibility of broadcasting courses via satellite to sparsely populated areas of Appalachia. Based on the results of a needs assessment sponsored by the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), AESP offered four graduate level education courses, two in career education and two in diagnostic and prescriptive reading instruction. The results of this initial demonstration phase are reported in AESP Technical Reports #1-12.

Following this successful experimental period, AESP entered a planning stage which focused on expanding and diversifying programming using satellite technology. This planning period began with a needs assessment of the Appalachian region which has provided the basis for determining current programming priorities. Results of this assessment of needs are reported in AESP Technical Report #14. This needs assessment revealed that needs in Appalachia could be generally categorized into five areas: education, human resources and services, medicine and health, business and industry, and government. Based on these priority needs identified, nine workshops were planned and delivered in Summer 1977. Specifically, workshops were developed on the following topics: special education, child abuse, diagnostic and prescriptive reading instruction, cardiovascular physical assessment, and home energy conservation.

The format of each workshop was similar and consisted of a videotaped program, a live, interactive seminar, distribution of related printed materials designed to supplement the information presented in the tapes and the seminar, and the completion of evaluation instruments.

Another focus of this planning stage was the formative and summative evaluation of these workshops. The evaluation component of AESP developed and administered several instruments designed to give both participants and site monitors an opportunity to evaluate several aspects of the workshops including the videotapes, seminars, and equipment functioning. In addition, participants provided background information about themselves, answered cognitive questions designed to measure attainment of specific objectives, and respon ed to needs assessment items intended to determine future programming interests.

The following section of this report presents these results for each workshop delivered during the Summer of 1977. Table 1 presents a list of the titles and dates of delivery of the summer workshops. Parts one and two present the results of the two workshops offered in special education. Parts three, four, five and six detail the results of the workshops in child abuse, reading instruction, cardiovascular physical assessment, and home energy conservation respectively.

TABLE 1

SCHEDULE OF WORKSHOPS DELIVERED DURING SUMMER 1977

Workshop	Date
Special Education: The Role of the Placement Committee in Developing Individual Education Plans for Handicapped Children	June 1, 1977
Special Education: Issues in the Education of the Handicapped	July 12, 1977
Child Abuse: Initial Issues in Child Abuse	July 19, 1977
Child Abuse: Some Perspectives on Treatment	July 26, 1977
DPRI: Follow-Up	August 2, 1977
Cardiovascular Physical Assessment: Overview	August 9, 1977
Cardiovascular Physical Assessment: Heart Sounds, Pressures, and Pulses	August 16, 1977
Home Energy Conservation: Part I	August 30, 1977
Home Energy Conservation: Part II	September 6, 1977

SPECIAL EDUCATION: THE ROLE OF THE PLACEMENT COMMITTEE IN DEVELOPING INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLANS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

June 1, 1977

Donna M. Mertens

The passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) in late 1975 created a need for the entire education community to understand its new roles concerning handicapped children. While the law is designed to aid the more than eight million handicapped children in this country, it does present many challenges and new responsibilities for teachers, administrators, psychologists and parents. In order to help the educational community comply with the new law, the Appalachian Education Satellite Project, in conjunction with the Kentucky State Department of Education and the Special Education Satellite Project at the University of Kentucky presented a workshop entitled "Simulation: The Role of the Placement Committee in Developing Individual Education Plans for Handicapped Children."

In order to comply with the provisions of P.L. 94-142, school districts are required to formulate committees for the purpose of developing an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for each child who is placed in a special education program.

The guidelines stated in Public Law 94-142 for implementing such a program at the local level specify the following procedures: the formation of a placement committee which will have the responsibility for making specific decisions concerning a specific child and the development by the committee of an individual education program (IEP) based on an evaluation of that child's needs.

The law also requires that the child's parents or guardians must be involved in the IEP development process, and that the parents have a right to an impartial hearing if they are dissatisfied with the plan that is developed for their child.

These procedures differ dramatically from those used in the past and expand the tasks and responsibilities, as well as membership of the group involved in decision-making about any given child. This program focused on the roles of the various members of the Placement Committee in developing an IEP.

Format of the Workshop

The workshop included a presentation of a videotape and an interactive seminar and distribution of printed materials. A 50 minute videotape, which was developed by the staff of the Central Kentucky Child Service Demonstration Center for Children With Learning Disabilities and produced by Kentucky Educational Television, was broadcast from the University of Kentucky television studios over AESP's ATS-6 satellite system. The tape presented a simulation of a Placement Committee meeting which was based on an actual case history.

At the completion of the videotape, there was a short break to allow the participants an opportunity to formulate questions concerning IEP development and the Placement Committee process. Participants were then given an opportunity to direct questions for 45 minutes for panel members located in the television studios in Lexington, Kentucky. The seminar was produced by AESP's Media Services Component in the University of Kentucky Television Studios. The panel was comprised of the following staff members of the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Children, Kentucky Department of Education:

Lois Adams, Administrative Assistant

Lynette Uhl, Director, Division of Supporting Services

Misha Phillips, Director, Child Service Demonstration Center

The panel was moderated by Ray Simches, Consultant to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, United States Office of Education.

During the interactive seminar, participants could submit questions in one of four ways: 1) Five of the AESP sites were equipped to transmit questions via the ATS-3 VHF system; 2) ten of the AESP sites were equipped to transmit questions via teletype; 3) all sites could transmit questions via telephone, and 4) Lexington participants' questions were hand carried to the studio.

Each participant also received a folder which contained printed material designed to supplement the material presented in the television program.

At the end of the seminar, the site monitors collected an evaluation form that each participant completed which provided information concerning the background characteristics of viewers, their reactions to the film and interactive seminars, and their reception of the technical quality of the presentation. The participants also responded to several questions designed to measure the attainment of specific cognitive and affective objectives, and to several questions designed to ascertain their interest in future special education programs. This information forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

The analysis of participant reaction was conducted for three separate groups. The first group, who were recruited by AESP site coordinators,

consisted of 114 persons who watched the program at the 14 AESP sites. Of these 114 persons, completed evaluation forms were received from 87 persons or 76% of the participants. The second group of 49 persons were from 21 states and the District of Columbia and watched the program in Lexington, KY. This group was composed of participants in the Conference on Applications of Communication Satellites in the Education of the Handicapped sponsored by the Special Education Satellite Project. The third group consisted of 9 persons who watched the program in Greenbelt, Maryland. The frequency of participants by site is presented in Table 2 and the characteristics of each of these groups is presented in Table 3.

The three audiences differ considerably along the dimensions of sex, community in which they work, and position held during the academic year. Based on those who responded to the sex item, the AESP sites' audiences consisted of 71% females, the Lexington audience consisted of 30% females, and the Greenbelt audience was 38% female. Based on those who responded to the community item, the AESP site participants worked primarily in rural areas, while the Lexington and Greenbelt audiences worked primarily in urban areas. The AESP site participants were also more likely to represent school personnel such as principals, teachers, counselors, librarians, and nurses. The Lexington participants were more likely to represent higher education institutions and educational projects. The Greenbelt participants primarily represented government agencies. Because of these audience differences, the responses to the evaluation instrument for each audience are treated separately in the remainder of this report.

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE
SPECIAL EDUCATION WORKSHOP I

AESP Sites	Frequency
Huntsville, AL	3
Rainsville, AL	5
Guntersville, AL	12
LaFollette, TN	8
Tazewell, TN	6
Johnson City, TN	9
Norton, VA	6
Boone, NC	5
Stickleyville, VA	6
Cumberland, MD	20
Keyser, WV	2
McHenry, MD	10
Fredonia, NY	11
Olean, NY	11
Lexington, KY	49
Greenbelt, MD	9
Total	172

TABLE 3

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS
SPECIAL EDUCATION WORKSHOP I

Characteristics	AESP Sites	Lexington KY	Greenbelt MD	Overall
Sex				
Female	55	14	3	72
Male	23	33	5	61
No response	9	2	1	12
Community in which they work				
Rural	63	5	0	68
Urban	12	35	7	54
Suburban	5	9	1	15
No response	7	0	1	8
Position held during the 1976-77 academic year				
1. Administrator	8	11	1	20
2. Special education teacher	13	0	0	13
3. Elementary school teacher	13	0	0	13
4. Supervisor of Adult or Special Education Program	12	0	0	12
5. College professor	0	10	1	11
6. Consultant	2	6	0	8
7. Psychologist, Counselor or Psychometrist	7	0	0	7
8. Researcher	0	5	0	5
9. Government agency	0	0	4	4
10. Senior high school teacher	3	1	0	4
11. School nurse, librarian, or resource teacher	4	0	0	4
12. Parent	2	1	0	3
13. Speech therapist	2	0	0	2
14. Principal	2	0	0	2
15. Middle school teacher	2	0	0	2
16. Other	3	5	0	8
17. No response	14	10	3	27

Reaction to the Film

The participants were asked to rate the film, described earlier in this report, according to its value as a source of stimulation for the seminar discussion and to rate its overall value. They used the following scale to indicate their responses: 1 - excellent, 2 - very good, 3 - good, 4 - fair, 5 - poor. As a source of stimulation for the seminar discussion, the Greenbelt audience rated the film lowest (average rating = 3.38), the Lexington audience rated it in the middle (average rating = 2.92), and the AESP sites rated it highest (average rating = 2.27). This pattern was similar for the participants' overall rating of the film. The Greenbelt and Lexington participants gave it an average rating of 3.29 (between good and fair), and the AESP participants gave it an average rating of 2.22 (between very good and good).

The comments made by the participants shed some light on the reasons for these differential ratings. The Lexington participants criticized the film because it did not present an ideal model, but rather it presented a simulated committee meeting including portrayal of some of the weaknesses of such meetings. They recognized that such problems could stimulate critical thinking, however, their comments indicated that the presentation of a more idealized model would have been desirable. The comments of one participant summarize this criticism:

> "Specific IEP components should be more clearly spelled out. If this tape is used, I believe that the viewer should have certain questions directed to him/her in order that he/she can take specific note of what is transpiring and gain more in terms of the objectives about how to handle an IEP committee meeting."

The audience also commented that too much jargon was used and that the actors' portrayals were unrealistic.

The Greenbelt audience's comments also centered on the inaccuracies present in the film and the suggested desirability of showing a more ideal presentation of an IEP committee.

The AESP participants' comments were more positive. For example, they made such comments as: "Very informative for me", and "I thought many interesting and useful items were discussed." They did criticize the film because physical health information about the child was omitted and because they felt the portrayals of the roles were somewhat unrealistic.

Reaction to the Interactive Seminar

The participants were asked to react to the seminar moderator and participants, and to the answers they received during the seminar. They were also asked to provide their overall evaluation of the seminar. The majority of the Lexington (56%) and AESP (67%) respondents felt the moderator was fine. The most frequent recommendation for improvement was that he should have kept the seminar moving at a faster pace so more questions could be answered. They also thought that occasional summary statements would be helpful.

The participants were not as positive about the seminar panel members. The largest pe. entage of the participants who felt the panel members were fine were those at the AESP sites (47%). The most frequent recommendations by the participants in all three groups were to use more parents, teachers, students, principals, and other school personnel as guests. In addition, several of the participants from the three groups recommended that other states' points of view should have been represented (all of the panel members were from Kentucky).

Fifty-three percent of the participants at the AESP sites felt the answers received from the panelists were fine. Twenty-nine percent of the Lexington participants and 25% of the Greenbelt participants felt the answers

were fine. The most frequent recommendation for improvement from all three groups was that more direct answers should be given to questions. Twenty percent of the Lexington group and 13% of the AESP group felt more frequent use of specific examples would have improved the answers received from the panelists.

The Lexington and AESP groups rated the overall value of the seminar quite similarly (average ratings of 2.31 and 2.33 respectively). The Greenbelt group gave the seminar an average rating of 2.63. These ratings are all between very good (2) and good (3).

Attainment of Objectives

Several specific cognitive and affective objectves were defined for this program. These were:

A. Cognitive objectives - The participant should be able to:
   1. Identify the components of an Individualized Education Plan;
   2. Recognize problems that are encountered by Placement Committees in developing IEP's.

B. Affective objectives - The participants should:
   1. Increase their awareness of the roles of Placement Committee members;
   2. Develop an understanding of the issues that are involved in the development of IEP's;
   3. Increase their sensitivity to the role of the parent as a participating member of the Placement Committee.

The first objective, identifying components of an IEP, was achieved with an accuracy level of 83% for both the Lexington and Greenbelt groups

and 84% for for the AESP group. The attainment of the second objective, recognizing problems with IEP, was measured by means of five true-false questions. Of the people responding, 91% of the Lexington group, 87% of the Greenbelt group, and 81% of the AESP group answered the items correctly.

The participants commented on several of these items. The first item, "Professional members of the Placement Committee should have the IEP developed before the parent meets with them" was considered to be false by the staff of the Special Education Satellite Project. Participants from all three groups commented that the professional members should have a plan in mind before meeting with the parent and should allow the parent an opportunity for approval prior to implementation. Another statement "The Placement Committee has the final authority in the development of an IEP" was considered false by the Special Education Satellite Project staff. Participants from all three groups commented that this was true unless contested, and the principal could decide or the parent could appeal. A third item was also commented on by participants who felt that written permission from the parent was not required if the educators won a court decision.

The affective objectives were achieved at quite different levels for the three groups. The first objective, to increase their awareness of the roles of Placement Committee members, was measured by asking participants to react to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this program, I believe that I will be more effective in serving on a Placement Committee." The Greenbelt group reacted neutrally to this statement, the Lexington group responded between neutral and moderately agree, and the AESP group responded between strongly agree and moderately agree. One explanation for this

divergence of opinion may be that the persons attending the session in the AESP group would be more likely to be members of a Placement Committee than would either the Lexington or Greenbelt groups.

The attainment of the second objective, to develop an understanding of the issues that are involved in the development of an IEP, was measured by having participants respond to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this program, I believe that I have a better understanding of the IEP." The Greenbelt group responded neutrally to this item and the Lexington group moderately agreed with it. The AESP group responded between strongly and moderately agree. The explanation presented above may explain this divergence of opinion as well.

The attainment of the third objective, to increase their sensitivity to the role of the parent on the Placement Committee, was measured by having participants respond to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this program, I believe that I am more sensitive to the role that parents play in the IEP process." The Greenbelt group responded between neutral and moderately agree, the Lexington group tended to moderately agree, and the AESP group responded between moderately and strongly agree.

The cognitive and affective objectives were more successfully achieved for the AESP group than with the other two groups, with the exception of the second cognitive objective. This may be due to the ambiguity of the items which were used to measure this objective.

Technical Aspects

AESP site monitors rated the technical functioning of the equipment used in the program, and participants rated the quality of the reception of the audio and video signals during the program. The site monitors' ratings of the

equipment functioning are presented in Table 4. The ATS-6 system operated with a reliability of 88% (2 malfunctions out of a possible 17). The two malfunctions occurred at Greenbelt, MD and Guntersville, AL. In Greenbelt, the television monitor malfunctioned for the first ten minutes of the broadcast. When a new monitor was substituted the signal was received very well. In Guntersville, AL, the site was unable to receive the last 30 minutes of the broadcast. This was because Guntersville is on the fringe area of ATS-6's broadcast footprint, and the fringe areas do not receive a stable signal. In order to alleviate this problem in the future, AESP plans a double delivery, one to northern sites and one to southern sites.

Overall, the site monitors rated the video reception as having between no and barely perceptible distortion. They also rated the objectionableness of the distortion between "not annoying" and "slightly annoying". The average rating of the clarity of the picture received by AESP participants was between excellent and very good. The Greenbelt group rated the picture as excellent and the Lexington group rated the picture very good.

The site monitors rated the quality of the sound as generally readable with little or no difficulty and the strength of the signal as being good to very good. The AESP participants rated the quality of the sound received between excellent and very good. The Greenbelt and Lexington groups rated the quality of the sound received between very good and good.

Five of the AESP sites were equipped with VHF units designed to transmit their questions to the Lexington studio via ATS-3. Lexington and Greenbelt also had VHF units. Out of these seven units, five were working satisfactorily during the workshop. Therefore this equipment functioned with a reliability of 71%. The sites whose VHF units were not working could

TABLE 4

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING
SPECIAL EDUCATION WORKSHOP I

Site	ATS-6 System Video	ATS-6 System Audio	ATS-3 System VHF Audio
10 Huntsville, AL	5 x 5	2 x 2	out
11 Rainsville, AL	4 x 4	2 x 2	
12 Guntersville, AL	3 x 3	3 x 2	
15 LaFollette, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3	3 x 3
16 Tazewell, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3	
17 Johnson City, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3	3 x 3
20 Norton, VA	5 x 5	3 x 3	3 x 3
21 Stickleyville, VA	5 x 5	3 x 2	
22 Boone, NC	5 x 5	3 x 3	
25 Cumberland, MD	5 x 5	3 x 3	out
26 McHenry, MD	5 x 5	3 x 3	
27 Keyser, WV	5 x 5	3 x 3	
35 Fredonia, NY	3 x 4	2 x 3	2 x 3
36 Olean, NY	4 x 4	3 x 3	
37 Edinboro, PA	4 x 4	3 x 3	
Lexington, KY	5 x 5	3 x 3	3 x 3
Greenbelt, MD	5 x 5	3 x 3	3 x 3

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain.
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable.
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise.
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise.
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signa
2. Fair signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

still transmit their questions via telephone. McHenry, MD participants also transmitted their questions via telephone because their teletype machine did not work.

Needs Assessment Information

AESP is interested in offering more programs on topics related to special education. Therefore, participants were asked to provide input to help determine the specific topics related to special education which could possibly be developed into future programs. They were asked to respond to a number of topics in terms of their interest in attending a workshop on each topic using the following scale:

1 - no interest

2 - some interest

3 - great interest

The results of the ratings by the AESP group are presented in Table 5, for the Lexington group in Table 6, and for the Greenbelt group in Table 7. The AESP group is the target audience for AESP programming, and therefore, the reactions of this group are of primary interest. The fact that 28 of the 30 items were rated between some and great interest by this group suggests a very strong interest generally in the area of special education topics. The strongest interest was expressed in programs concerning working with the parents of the handicapped, techniques for mainstreaming, instructional materials for the handicapped, language development techniques, and design and development of instructional materials. The Greenbelt group tended to rate all of the topics at a lower interest level than the AESP group and the Lexington group rated the items between the AESP and Greenbelt groups.

TABLE 5

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS BY AESP PARTICIPANTS SPECIAL EDUCATION WORKSHOP I

	Item	Average Rating
1.	Working with parents of the handicapped	2.61
2.	Techniques for mainstreaming	2.56
3.	Instructional materials appropriate for the handicapped	2.50
4.	Language development techniques	2.48
5.	Design and development of instructional materials	2.47
6.	Special needs and procedures for the emotionally disturbed	2.45
7.	Due process and procedural safeguards	2.45
8.	Special needs and procedures for the mildly retarded (EMR)	2.44
9.	Career/vocational education for the handicapped	2.43
10.	Classroom management of exceptional children	2.42
11.	Special needs and procedures for the multiple handicapped	2.42
12.	Record keeping systems	2.41
13.	Task analysis and instructional planning	2.40
14.	Special needs and procedures for the gifted	2.36
15.	Informal educational assessment	2.32
16.	Working with the resource room teacher	2.31
17.	Special needs and procedures for the moderately retarded (TMR)	2.29
18.	Reading diagnosis and instruction	2.21
19.	Special needs and procedures for the speech impaired	2.20
20.	Special needs and procedures for the deaf and hard of hearing	2.20

TABLE 5--CONTINUED

Item	Average Rating
21. Adapted physical education	2.19
22. Educationally relevant characteristics of exceptional children	2.15
23. Assistive and adaptive equipment for the handicapped	2.15
24. Special needs and procedures for the crippled	2.15
25. Special needs and procedures for the hearing disabled	2.10
26. Special needs and procedures for the blind and partially sighted	2.09
27. Special needs and procedures for the severely retarded (SMR)	2.09
28. Math diagnosis and instruction	2.08
29. Translating IEP's	1.97
30. The role of the impartial hearing officer	1.95

TABLE 6

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS BY LEXINGTON PARTICIPANTS SPECIAL EDUCATION WORKSHOP I

	Item	Average Rating
1.	Working with parents of the handicapped	2.70
2.	Special needs and procedures for the gifted	2.48
3.	Classroom management of exceptional children	2.45
4.	Design and development of instructional materials	2.45
5.	Special needs and procedures for the deaf and hard of hearing	2.44
6.	Instructional materials appropriate for the handicapped	2.41
7.	Special needs and procedures for the hearing disabled	2.40
8.	Informal educational assessment	2.39
9.	Techniques for mainstreaming	2.38
10.	Due process and procedural safeguards	2.34
11.	Special needs and procedures for the emotionally disturbed	2.32
12.	Special needs and procedures for the blind and partially sighted	2.32
13.	Special needs and procedures for the multiple handicapped	2.32
14.	Record keeping systems	2.27
15.	Special needs and procedures for the crippled	2.24
16.	The role of the impartial hearing officer	2.23
17.	Career/vocational education for the handicapped	2.21
18.	Educationally relevant characteristics of exceptional children	2.17
19.	Task analysis and instructional planning	2.15
20.	Assistive and adaptive equipment for the handicapped	2.14
21.	Special needs and procedures for the speech impaired	2.13
22.	Special needs and procedures for the severely retarded (SMR)	2.13

TABLE 6--CONTINUED

Item	Average Rating
23. Special needs and procedures for the moderately retarded (TMR)	2.12
24. Working with the resource room teacher	2.11
25. Language development techniques	2.11
26. Translating IEP's	2.09
27. Special needs and procedures for the mildly retarded	2.04
28. Math diagnosis and instruction	1.89
29. Reading diagnosis and instruction	1.85
30. Adapted physical education	1.64

TABLE 7

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS BY GREENBELT PARTICIPANTS SPECIAL EDUCATION WORKSHOP I

	Item	Average Rating
1.	Special needs and procedures for the hearing disabled	2.33
2.	Classroom management of exceptional children	2.20
3.	Informal educational assessment	2.20
4.	Special needs and procedures for the speech impaired	2.17
5.	Special needs and procedures for the multiple handicapped	2.17
6.	Working with parents of the handicapped	2.17
7.	Special needs and procedures for the emotionally disturbed	2.00
8.	Special needs and procedures for the deaf	2.00
9.	Educationally relevant characteristics of exceptional children	2.00
10.	Task analysis and instructional planning	2.00
11.	Language development techniques	2.00
12.	The role of the impartial hearing officers	2.00
13.	Design and development of instructional materials	2.00
14.	Working with the resource room teacher	1.83
15.	Reading diagnosis and instruction	1.83
16.	Instructional materials appropriate for the handicapped	1.83
17.	Techniques for mainstreaming	1.80
18.	Math diagnosis and instruction	1.67
19.	Record keeping systems	1.67
20.	Special needs and procedures for the gifted	1.67

TABLE 7--CONTINUED

Item	Average Rating
21. Due process and procedural safeguards	1.60
22. Career/vocational education for the handicapped	1.60
23. Adapted physical education	1.60
24. Special needs and procedures for the blind and partially sighted	1.60
25. Special needs and procedures for the crippled	1.60
26. Special needs and procedures for the moderately retarded	1.60
27. Special needs and procedures for the severely retarded	1.60
28. Translating IEP's	1.40
29. Special needs and procedures for the mildly retarded	1.40
30. Assistive and adaptive equipment for the handicapped	1.25

Fifty-seven percent of the AESP participants indicated that they would be interested in a graduate or undergraduate level course in special education. This information supports the need for such a course for the target audience of Appalachian educators.

Conclusions

Three distinct groups participated in the special education workshop. These were: 1) one hundred and fourteen people at fourteen AESP sites throughout Appalachia who represented primarily rural school personnel; 2) forty-nine people in Lexington, KY who represented primarily urban higher education and educational project personnel; and 3) nine people in Greenbelt, MD who represented primarily urban government agency personnel. The three groups reacted to a film and interactive seminar, several cognitive and

affective questions, the technical quality of the broadcast and topics for future programs. The AESP and Lexington participants rated the film between very good and good and the Greenbelt group rated it between good and fair. The major criticism of the film were that it presented a simulation along with certain errors and omissions rather than an ideal model and that the situation was somewhat unrealistic. The seminar was rated between very good and good by all three groups. Suggestions for improvement included: 1) the moderator should have kept the seminar moving at a faster pace so more questions could be answered, 2) panel members should have included more school personnel and representatives of other states and should have provided more direct answers to participants' questions.

The ATS-6 system operated with 88% reliability and the two equipment failures that did occur caused participants to miss only 10 and 30 minutes of the program at two sites.

The needs assessment information indicated a strong interest in programs in all areas of special education for the AESP sites.

SPECIAL EDUCATION: "ISSUES IN THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED"

July 12, 1977

Jody L. Fitzpatrick

With the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children (PL 94-142) in November, 1975, Congress mandated a free and appropriate public education for all handicapped children. This law represents a turning point in the history of the education and treatment of the handicapped by ensuring that all handicapped have the right to receive a free, appropriate public education to reach his/her potential.

The enactment of the provisions of the law presents an enormous challenge to the educators and the community. In order for the advantages inherent in the provisions of PL 94-142 to become a reality, the public must be made aware of the critical aspects of the law and their support must be obtained. Parents, teachers, and school administrators who have not previously dealt with the handicapped must be educated concerning the handicapped. Old attitudes must be replaced with realistic awareness of not only the problems, but the capabilities of the handicapped person to ultimately enable these persons to be included in the mainstream of our society. Public awareness and the leadership of school boards and administrators will play a vital role in the success of PL 94-142 in the public schools.

The workshop "Issues in the Education of the Handicapped" was concerned with this aspect of public awareness. The workshop was designed to demonstrate the capabilities of various handicapped individuals, the attitudes they had encountered, and the types of innovative educational programs which have been developed to educate the handicapped person.

Format of the Workshop

The workshop included a presentation of a videotape and an interactive seminar and distribution of printed materials. A 50-minute videotape, "Including Me," which was developed by Capital Cities TV Productions, Inc. in cooperation with Closer Look and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was broadcast from the University of Kentucky television studios over AESP's ATS-6 satellite system. This film tells about the lives of six young people who now have the benefits of new changes in the laws and in the public's orientation to the handicapped--changes that have allowed these young people to learn, grow and fulfill their promise as individuals. Issues raised in the film include; mainstreaming, preschool education and early identification, the future--jobs and independent living, the questions of costs, and civil rights for the handicapped.

Participants then took part in a 40-minute interactive seminar; during this time questions from the participants were transmitted to panel members in the television studios in Lexington, Kentucky. Panel members consisted of:

Marie McKeever, a parent/volunteer, Chairman of the San Francisco Bay Area Council for Handicapped, and a representative of Closer Look

Barbara Risovich, a public school teacher in Morgantown, West Virginia

Parthenia Smith, School Administrator and President of Council for Exceptional Children.

The panel was moderated by William Healey, Director of the School Services Program, American Speech and Hearing Association.

During the interactive seminar, participants could submit questions in one of three ways: 1) five of the AESP sites were equipped to transmit questions via the ATS-3 VHF system; 2) eight of the AESP sites were equipped to transmit questions via teletype; and 3) all sites could transmit questions via telephone.

Each participant also received a printed orientation to the workshop designed to supplement the material presented in the television program. This orientation included an overview of format, objectives, potential questions and references.

At the end of the seminar, each participant completed an evaluation form which provided information concerning the background characteristics of viewers, their reactions to the film and interactive seminars, and their perception of the technical quality of the presentation. The participants also responded to several questions designed to measure the attainment of specific objectives, and to several questions designed to assess public awareness and the status of mainstreaming in their particular community. This information forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

The audience for the workshop consisted of 147 persons, 95 females and 26 males, who watched the program at 13 AESP sites. Participants were questioned concerning the nature of the community in which they worked and the position they held. The audience was primarily a rural one with 94 participants working in a rural area, 24 in an urban area, and two in a suburban area. The positions held by participants were diverse; however, most participants were school personnel. Tables 8 and 9 list the number of participants at each site and the positions held by the participants.

TABLE 8

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE
SPECIAL EDUCATION WORKSHOP II

AESP Sites	Frequency
Huntsville, AL	18
Rainsville, AL	13
Guntersville, AL	10
Rome, GA	5
Tazewell, TN	6
Johnson City, TN	1
Norton, VA	6
Stickleyville, VA	2
Cumberland, MD	24
McHenry, MD	7
Keyser, MD	35
Fredonia, NY	11
Olean, NY	9
Total	147

Evaluation of Workshop

The evaluation of the success of the workshop consisted of the examination of four specific aspects of the program: 1) participants' reaction to the filmed segment of the workshop, 2) participants' reaction to the interactive seminar, 3) the participants' achievement of the objectives of the seminar, and 4) the technical functioning of the equipment. Each of these components are addressed in the following sections.

TABLE 9

PARTICIPANT'S POSITION DURING 1976-1977 ACADEMIC YEAR
SPECIAL EDUCATION WORKSHOP II

Position	Frequency
1. Administrator	7
2. Regular classroom teacher	11
3. Special education teacher	30
4. Resource room teacher	9
5. Parent of handicapped child	6
6. Special education supervisor	5
7. Social worker	15
8. School nurse or nurse's aide	5
9. Speech or hearing clinician	3
10. Psychologist, counselor, or psychometrist	4
11. Administrator of local program for epilepsy, blindness, or vocational rehabilitation	5
12. Head Start personnel	3
13. Assistant teacher	4
14. Other	14

Reaction to the Film

The purpose of this facet of the evaluation was to determine (a) how the participants responded to the film in general, and (b) the effect of the film on the participants' level of awareness concerning the needs of the handicapped. This second objective was designed to measure the success of the film in its stated goal of raising public awareness of the needs of the handicapped and the potential of PL 94-142.

Participants were also asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with the following two statements:

"The videotaped program 'Including Me' raised my level of awareness of the needs and feelings of handicapped people."

"I believe 'Including Me' could be successful in raising the level of awareness of people in my community concerning the needs and feelings of handicapped people."

Participants responded according to the following scale: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = moderately agree, 3 = neutral, 4 = moderately disagree, 5 = strongly disagree.

On both of these items, participants responded affirmatively. Participants were generally quite optimistic concerning the utility of the film in raising the level of awareness of people in their local communities. The mean response for the first item concerning the effect of the film on the participants' own level of awareness was 1.79 (between strongly agree and moderately agree). The mean response for the second item concerning the potential effect of the film on community attitudes was 1.45 (again between strongly agree and moderately agree but further in the direction of strongly agree).

There were quite a number of participant comments to these items which reflect the nature of the response to the film. A number of people who were already working actively with the handicapped indicated the film did not raise their level of awareness as their consciousness had already been raised through their experiences with handicapped persons. However, they did feel the film could do much to enlighten the general public. Others with less experience in this area indicated the film had positively affected their attitudes and awareness.

The primary concerns seemed to be with the exceptional nature of the programs depicted which might be unrealistic for most communities to adopt. Comments included:

> "'Including Me' is a good 'feeling' picture, but unrealistic in solutions. The children and probably parents depicted are exceptional and in exceptional situations."
>
> "The people portrayed were exceptions to the rule. The programs portrayed were also exceptions to the usual ones found. Now make a film on how to go about changing the system. What can one person do? Show people how to get involved."

A secondary concern of participants for this particular workshop was the general nature of the programming. The comments below typifies this criticism:

> "The program seems directed primarily to parents rather than regular educators. This is good for public TV, but not really enough for an inservice for teachers."

Reaction to the Interactive Seminar

The participants were asked to react to the seminar moderator, panel members, and the answers they received. They were also asked to provide an overall evaluation of the seminar.

The vast majority of respondents (81%) felt the moderator was fine. The most frequent recommendation for improvement was to keep the seminar moving at a faster pace so more questions could be answered (10%).

Response to the panel was generally positive with 48% of the respondents indicating that the seminar participants were fine. Others

felt more teachers, students, principals, and other school personnel should have been included on the panel. Specific comments suggested participants were pleased with the panel discussion and particularly with the comments of Marie McKeever, the parent/volunteer.

Fifty-five percent of the respondents indicated the answers received from the panelists were fine. The most frequent suggestion was for more direct answers to the questions and more frequent use of specific examples.

The mean overall rating of the seminar was 2.22 (between very good and good).

Attainment of Objectives

The specific affective and cognitive objectives of the program were:

A. Cognitive Objectives - The participants will:
   1. Recognize the potential of handicapped individuals;
   2. Know the rationale behind PL 94-142 and be aware of some means by which public schools might meet the needs of handicapped children;
   3. Recognize some of the major components of PL 94-142.

B. Affective Objectives - Participants will:
   1. Increase their awareness of the feelings and needs of handicapped individuals;
   2. Express a willingness to work to improve public awareness of the needs of handicapped people.

These objectives and items to measure the attainment of these objectives were written with the assistance of Dr. Edward Blackhurst, Chairman, Department of Special Education, University of Kentucky.

In order to measure the first objective, recognizing the potential of handicapped individuals, participants were asked to agree or disagree with the following item: "Very few children with handicaps will attain complete independence as adults." Participants were considered to have achieved the objective if they indicated moderate or strong disagreement with the item. Fifty percent of the participants responded in this manner. Comments from participants who agreed with the statement suggested that some agreement was due not to a failure to see the potential of handicapped individuals, but to a lack of faith in the educational system, i.e. "Most have the potential, but, in fact, will not have the opportunity."

The attainment of the second objective was measured by three items concerning the rationale for PL 94-142 and the participants' awareness of ways in which the provisions might be met. Seventy-six percent of the respondents answered these items correctly indicating that participants did have an awareness of the cost and educational rationale for PL 94-142 and had a better awareness of the types of educational programs which might be developed to meet the needs of handicapped children in the public schools.

The third objective, concerning knowledge of the major components of PL 94-142, was measured by two items concerning parents' rights and the participation of handicapped children in regular classrooms. Seventy-six percent of the respondents were considered to have achieved this objective. Ninety-five percent of the respondents agreed to the statement "Parents of children with handicaps have the legal right to approve the educational plan for their children and review it periodically." However, only 57% of the participants responded correctly to the item, "Children with handicaps should receive all their education in regular classrooms with children without handicaps." A correct response to this statement would be to

disagree as the law is concerned with both the least restrictive and most appropriate educational environment for handicapped individuals. This issue was demonstrated in the program with several of the handicapped students who received part or all of their education in special classes. As this item is measuring a more subtle distinction than the first item, it might be expected that fewer participants would respond correctly. However, as 57% did respond to the item correctly and comments indicated an accurate perception of this concept, it may be concluded that the majority of respondents did achieve this portion of the objective.

The first affective objective was to increase participants' awareness of the feelings and needs of handicapped individuals. This objective was measured by four items. Two items were self-report items asking participants to indicate whether their understanding of the feelings and needs of the handicapped had been improved as a result of participating in this workshop; the remaining two items were concerned with an awareness of the effect attitudes have on the treatment and education of the handicapped.

Seventy-seven percent of the respondents attained the objective according to their responses to the items. Comments to the items indicated that most respondents are aware of the impact of inappropriate attitudes toward the handicapped. Some participants with more training in special education felt that their understanding of the needs and feelings of the handicapped had not been improved as a result of participation in the workshop as they were already familiar with these issues. However, they did feel the program would be beneficial to teachers with less expertise in this area.

The second affective objective was concerned with the participants' willingness to work to improve public awareness of the needs of the handicapped. This objective was measured by participants' responses to the following item:

"Please circle the statement(s) which most closely reflect(s) action you will take as a result of this program.

a) I would be willing to appear on a panel in my local community in conjunction with the "Including Me" program
b) I would be willing to actively assist the local television station in publicizing the program
c) I will recommend that my friends, students, and/or associates watch this program
d) I will not be able to assist in this effort
e) I do not want to participate in this effort

Participants were allowed to select more than one item. Seventeen percent of the respondents indicated willingness to appear on a panel; 24% were willing to actively assist in promotional efforts; and 71% would recommend the program to others. Only 3% indicated they would not be able to participate in the effort, and none indicated an unwillingness to participate. These figures would again appear to reflect the participants' satisfaction with the program and their endorsement of it as a tool for improving public awareness of the needs of the handicapped. As fully 71% of the audience was willing to recommend the program to others, it would appear that this objective was attained.

Technical Aspects

The technical functioning of the satellite delivery system was evaluated by both participants and site monitors. Participants were asked to simply rate the clarity of the picture and the quality of the sound in the program. Site monitors are asked to rate the readability and signal strength of the

audio system and the perceptibility and objectionableness of distortion in the video system (see Table 10). They are also asked to report any equipment malfunctions.

Participants rated the clarity of the picture as being between excellent and very good with the mean rating being 1.92 on a 5-point scale (1 = excellent, 5 = poor). Video reception also received a good rating from the site monitors. Perceptibility of video distortion was rated between barely perceptible distortion and imperceptible distortion. The objectionableness of the distortion was rated between slightly annoying and not annoying by the site monitors. These ratings indicate generally good video reception.

The quality of the sound or audio reception was rated between very good and good by participants with the mean rating being 2.30 on a five-point scale (1 = excellent, 5 = poor). This rating is lower than that given to the video reception, but is still within readable range. The weaker audio signal is also reflected in the site monitors' ratings of audio signal readability and strength. The average rating of readability is between readable with no difficulty and readable with difficulty; the average rating of signal strength is between very good signals and fair signals. However, the Fredonia, New York site reported unreadable signals and faint or very weak signals. The very weak audio signals at this particular site influenced the lower rating of the audio signal.

The ATS-6 system operated with a reliability of 92% (1 malfunction out of a possible 13). This malfunction was due to the poor audio reception at Fredonia, New York.

In summary, the technical functioning of the satellite delivery proceeded smoothly with the exception of the weak audio signal at one

TABLE 10

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING
SPECIAL EDUCATION WORKSHOP II

Site		ATS-6 System		ATS-3 System VHF
		Video	Audio	Audio
10	Huntsville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3	3 x 3
11	Rainsville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3	
12	Guntersville, AL	4 x 4	3 x 2	
16	Tazewell, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3	
21	Stickleyville, VA	5 x 5	3 x 3	
26	McHenry, MD	5 x 5	3 x 3	
27	Keyser, WV	5 x 5	3 x 3	3 x 3
35	Fredonia, NY	4 x 4	1 x 1	
36	Olean, NY	5 x 5	3 x 3	

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain.
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable.
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise.
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise.
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signals
2. Fair signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

receiving site. Participants and site monitors were generally satisfied with the audio and video qualities.

Conclusions

The workshop "Issues in the Education of the Handicapped" was attended by 147 participants at thirteen sites in Appalachia. The workshop included a 50-minute public awareness film, "Including Me", and a 40-minute live, interactive seminar. Participants rated both the filmed program "Including Me" and the interactive seminar positively (2.07 and 2.22, respectively, on a 5-point Likert scale). Participants indicated the film had generally been successful in raising their level of awareness concerning the handicapped and were quite positive concerning the ability of the film to raise the level of awareness of the general public. Some concern was expressed concerning the exceptional nature of the situations shown. The moderator and participants on the panel were viewed as satisfactory.

The specific cognitive and affective objectives of the program were met by the participants. However, as the attainment of these objectives was measured without a pretest, caution should be used in interpreting these results. Self-report items concerning the affective objectives do support the conclusion that these objectives were achieved as a result of participation in the program.

In conclusion, the workshop was generally well received by participants. This was particularly true for those participants who had not previously had extensive experience with the handicapped. Participants indicated the program was successful in increasing awareness; however, the need for further programs and/or workshops to instruct educators in specific skills for working with the handicapped was indicated by many participants.

CHILD ABUSE: "INITIAL ISSUES IN CHILD ABUSE" AND "SOME PERSPECTIVES ON TREATMENT"

July 19 and July 26, 1977

Lea J. Perritt

In the past fifteen years the problem of child abuse has been recognized, many diagnostic and treatment approaches have been pioneered, and the legal concept of "children's rights" has emerged. Only recently, however, has the concept of prevention by education received attention.

In the long run, a well-organized preventive program could do much to alleviate the problems. This is significant in light of Gil's (1970) findings that of 12,000 physical abuse incidents reported in 1967 and 1968, 3.4 percent resulted in death and 4.6 percent in permanent damage. The study also found that prior to the reported incident of abuse, 29 percent of the abused children had deficiencies in social interaction, 14 percent in physical function, and 8 percent in intellectual function. Martin et al. (1974) followed up 57 abused children and found that nearly 53 percent of these children showed some signs of central nervous system damage.

The challenge now is to develop programs aimed at preventing the physical as well as emotional damage resulting from child abuse. Since nurses, social workers, and preschool teachers, as well as related para-professionals have the greatest contact with parents and children during the preschool years when the most serious abuse occurs, it appears logical that these persons should assume responsibility for this preventive and educative role.

This two-part series was designed to create an understanding of what child abuse is as well as the issues surrounding it including how child abuse occurs, the child protection laws, and an understanding of the role of the medical professions in dealing with the problem. The

program also presented two interrelated treatment options: the use of parent aides and multidisciplinary teams.

Format of the Workshops

The workshops were presented as a two-part series. Both programs included presentation of films, a panel discussion, and an interactive seminar.

In the first program, the 30-minute film entitled "Child Abuse and Neglect: A Parent's Perspective" which was developed by the Family Life Development Center in cooperation with the Educational Television Center at Cornell University was broadcast from the University of Kentucky television studios over AESP's ATS-6 satellite system. The film presented interviews with six women who had or potentially might have abused their children, in order to show why abuse occurs. At the completion of the film, panel members provided brief statements concerning characteristics of abusive parents, legal perspectives of child abuse, medical identification of child abuse, and national child abuse resources.

In the second session, a short film entitled "Child Abuse: A Perspective on Parent Aides" was broadcast. This film presented a discussion among six women who had been or were currently parent aides. They discussed their feelings about going into a home the first time, the specific actions they take with parents in order to provide a nurturing home, and their need for on-going support to continue their work. A short transition into a second film entitled "Child Abuse: A Treatment Perspective" was made by the moderator. This film presented a dramatization of a multi-disciplinary treatment team at which the

parents were present and illustrated the interaction that occurs when different professions work with parents in trying to create a changed life for abusive parents. At the conclusion of these two films panel members provided brief comments about their roles in a treatment team.

Participants were then given an opportunity to direct questions to panel members located in the television studios in Lexington, Kentucky. The seminars were produced by AESP's Media Services Component in the University of Kentucky Television Studios. The panel for the first session was comprised of the following persons:

Diane Meier-Erne, Director of the Alliance Project, Syracuse, New York

Dr. Robert Long, M.D., pediatrician

Mary Huber, editor of Family Life Development, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Frank Harrigan, lawyer and supervisor of the Children's Protective Service, Syracuse, New York

The panel members for the second session included Ms. Meier-Erne, Dr. Long, and Ms. Huber, as well as Sue Spier, Child Protective Consultant.

During the interactive seminars, participants could submit questions in one of three ways: 1) 5 of the AESP sites were equipped to transmit questions via the ATS-3 VHF system; 2) all of the AESP sites were equipped to transmit questions via teletype; and 3) all of the sites could transmit questions via telephone.

Each participant also received printed material designed to supplement the material presented in the television program.

At the end of the seminars, the site monitors collected an evaluation form that each participant completed which provided information concerning their background characteristics and their reactions to the films, the interactive seminars, and the technical quality of the presentations.

The participants also responded to several questions designed to measure the attainment of specific cognitive and affective objectives, and to several questions designed to ascertain their interest in future programs in human resource areas. This information forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

The analysis of participant reaction was conducted separately for the two sessions. The first session was watched by 250 persons and the second by 173 persons. It could not be determined how many persons attended both sessions, but at all but 2 sites attendance decreased from the first to the second session. The frequency of participants by site and session is presented in Table 11 and the characteristics of participants for each session are presented in Table 12.

The participants for each session were similar in regard to sex, community in which they worked, and position held during the academic year. The majority of participants were female and worked in a rural community. Of those who responded to the occupation item, about one third represented school personnel such as teachers and administrators. The majority (approximately 60%) were employed in other human resource areas such as social work and nursing. The greatest decrease in attendance from the first to second session was for the social workers. Seventy attended the first session and only 40 the second. The site monitors attributed this mainly to scheduling and vacation difficulties. It may also suggest, however, that the social workers as a group felt session two would be less relevant to them than the first. The third page of the questionnaire was inadvertently omitted from 26 of the questionnaires used with the first session and 8 of the questionnaires used with the second session.

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE AND SESSION
CHILD ABUSE WORKSHOPS

AESP Sites	Session I	Session II
Huntsville, AL	21	16
Rainsville, AL	13	6
Guntersville, AL	13	7
Rome, GA	19	14
LaFollette, TN	10	10
Tazewell, TN	11	8
Norton, VA	23	20
Stickleyville, VA	13	4
Cumberland, MD	48	24
McHenry, MD	12	17
Keyser, WV	15	12
Fredonia, NY	40	30
Olean, NY	12	5
Total	250	173

TABLE 12

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS BY SESSION
CHILD ABUSE WORKSHOPS

Characteristics	Session I		Session II	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Sex				
Female	169	67.60	138	79.77
Male	50	20.00	31	17.92
No response	31	12.40	4	2.31
Community in which they work				
Rural	136	54.40	105	60.69
Urban	65	26.00	47	27.17
Suburban	18	7.20	18	10.40
No response	31	12.40	03	1.73
Position held during the 1976-77 academic year				
Education:	66	29.46	52	31.52
Elementary school teacher	21		20	
Administrator	9		7	
Senior high teacher	6		2	
Teacher aide	5		3	
Day care director	5		1	
Preschool teacher	4		1	
Special education teacher	4		2	
Middle school teacher	3		7	
Day care center worker	3		2	
Adult education	2		2	
Other	4.		5	
Other human resources:	134	59.82	92	55.76
Social worker	70		40	
Nursing personnel	36		32	
Counselor; psychologist	14		9	
Extensive aide	7		2	
Outreach worker	2		3	
Nutritionist	2		1	
Other	3		5	
Other:	24	10.71	21	12.73
Student	12		2	
Law enforcement	1		3	
Pastor	1		0	
Bus driver	1		0	
Housewife	1		1	
Unemployed	1		0	
No response	7		15	
Missing	26		8	

Reaction to the Films

The participants were asked to rate the films, described earlier in this report, according to their value as a source of stimulation for the seminar discussions and to rate their overall value. They used the following scale to indicate their responses: 1 - excellent, 2 - very good, 3 - good, 4 - fair, 5 - poor. As a source of stimulation for the seminar discussion, the audience rated the film presented at the first session between good and very good (average rating = 2.48). The participants' overall rating of the first film was also between very good and good (average rating = 2.32). The two films presented in the second session were rated even higher. As a source of stimulation they received average ratings of 2.06 and 2.16 respectively and overall they received ratings of 2.11 and 1.84 respectively.

The comments made by the participants during the first session suggested that the film was somewhat superficial and lacked depth. In addition the sound quality was lacking, which may have contributed to the lower ratings. They also felt that abusive parents other than young mothers should have been interviewed.

Reaction to the Interactive Seminars

The participants were asked to react to the seminar moderator and the answers they received during the seminars. They were also asked to provide an overall evaluation of the seminars. The majority of the participants felt the answers they received during the seminars were fine (53% and 54% respectively). In both sessions, the most frequent criticisms were that more examples should have been used and that the questions could have been answered more directly. The majority of participants felt the moderator was fine (71% and 73% respectively). The most frequent

criticisms were that she should have provided summary statements occasionally and kept the seminar moving at a faster pace. Overall, both seminars received identical ratings of 2.22 which is between good and very good.

Attainment of Objectives

Several specific objectives were defined for each program. These were:

A. Workshop #1 - The participant should be able to:
   1. Recognize the physical and psychological characteristics of abusive families;
   2. Identify the national resources available for coping with the child abuse problem;
   3. Recognize required reporting procedures mandated by child abuse legislation.

B. Workshop #2 - The participant should be able to:
   1. Identify the roles of members of a treatment team including parent aides, family members, child protection workers, and medical personnel;
   2. Recognize the importance of involving all of the members of the multi-disciplinary team and of adhering to the philosophy of the team approach.

The first objective, recognizing the physical and psychological characteristics of abuse, was measured by asking participants to identify characteristics that indicated abuse. A past history of abuse was correctly identified by 92% of the participants, being in the middle of a crisis by 84%, isolation by 79%, and unrealistic expectations for children by 68%. Ninety-four percent of the participants correctly identified unusual patterns of bruises as indicative of an abused child, 62% identified a history of accidents, and 51% rope burns on the wrists.

The second objective, identifying national child abuse resources was achieved by 75% of the respondents. In relation to the third objective, recognizing required reporting procedures, 90% felt doctors should tell parents when they are going to report them to Children's Protective Services and 72% knew that most states have penalties for failure to report known child abuse cases.

For the second session, the first objective, identifying the roles of the members of a treatment team, 86% of the participants identified being open-minded and nonjudgmental, 82% identified teaching through role modeling, and 65% identified always being on call to their families during a crisis. The second objective, recognizing the importance of involving all the team members and adhering to the philosophy of the team approach, was measured cognitively and affectively. Sixty percent of the participants knew that when a multidisciplinary team approach is used the team members decide together whether or not the child remains in the home. Ninety-two percent of them agreed that parents should be at team meetings, 86% agreed that treatment planning is more effective with a multidisciplinary team, and 84% felt that it is not too much trouble to organize and work with other people on a team.

Technical Aspects

AESP site monitors rated the technical functioning of the equipment used in the programs and participants rated the quality of the reception of the audio and video signals during the programs. The site monitors' ratings of the equipment functioning are presented in Table 13. The ATS-6 system operated efficiently during the first session in all but one of 13 sites reporting. The malfunction occurred at Rome, GA where the audio

TABLE 13

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF ATS-6 SYSTEM
CHILD ABUSE WORKSHOPS

	Site	Session I		Session II	
		Video	Audio	Video	Audio
10	Huntsville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
11	Rainsville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
12	Guntersville, AL	4 x 4	3 x 3	3 x 3	2 x 2
14	Rome, GA	5 x 5	2 x 1	5 x 5	2 x 2
15	LaFollette, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
16	Tazewell, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
20	Norton, VA	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
21	Stickleyville, VA	5 x 5	3 x 3	4 x 4	3 x 3
25	Cumberland, MD	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
26	McHenry, MD	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
27	Keyser, WV	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
35	Fredonia, NY	5 x 5	3 x 3	4 x 5	3 x 3
36	Olean, NY	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signals
2. Faint signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

strength was very low. The strength was boosted with the use of local equipment at the receiving site. During the second session, Rome, GA again had audio difficulties. The malfunction was, however, improved considerably during the program by the RCC engineer. Guntersville, AL also reported difficulty with both the audio and video signals during the second program. Stickleyville, VA had a problem during the second session in that the picture gradually washed out. This site felt the problem was at Lexington or NASA. Overall, for both programs the site monitors rated the video reception as having between no and barely perceptible distortion. They also rated the objectionableness of the distortion between "not annoying" and "slightly annoying." The quality of the audio system, however, was rated slightly higher for the first program. With the exception of the two sites mentioned previously, the site monitors rated the quality of the sound for both programs readable with practically no or no difficulty and the signal strength as being good to very good.

The average ratings of the clarity of the pictures were between excellent and very good for the first session (average rating of 1.91) and between very good and good for the second session (average rating of 2.29). The quality of the sound was rated between very good and good for both sessions (average ratings of 2.13 and 2.06 respectively).

Five of the AESP sites were equipped with VHF units designed to transmit their questions to the Lexington studio via ATS-3. Out of these units, 4 were working satisfactorily during the first session and all during the second session. During both sessions all sites but Rome, GA could transmit their questions by telephone. This is because there is no long distance service available at the site location. Teletype was inoperable at Huntsville during the first session and at Stickleyville, VA during the second session.

Needs Assessment Information

In order to determine the amount of interest in offering more programs on human resource topics, participants were asked to respond to questions related to their interest in future workshops. 85 percent of the participants at the first session indicated an interest in participating in additional workshops, however, only 48% indicated an interest in a graduate or undergraduate course on a human resource topic. This may be due to the large number of persons employed in occupations where obtaining additional credit courses is not required (i.e. social work). The topics most frequently mentioned as areas of interest for future programs were counseling and interviewing techniques with parents and children, prevention and early identificiation of child abuse, one parent families, and foster parenting. The time of day that was most convenient was the afternoon, with 61% of those responding indicating this time. The next most convenient time was evening (39%), and the least preferred time was mornings (16%). Twenty-three percent of the participants indicated no preferred time.

At the second session, 80% indicated an interest in additional workshops of this kind and 50% said they would be interested in a graduate or undergraduate course on a human resource topic. Of those indicating a most convenient time for programs, 51% indicated afternoon, 31% evening, and 14% morning. Thirty-four percent of the participants did not respond to this item at all, suggesting that perhaps no time is really convenient.

Conclusions

A total of 250 persons attended the first session and 173 the second session of a two-part workshop on Child Abuse. The largest number of participants at both sessions were social workers. The next largest group was

nursing personnel. The participants at both sessions reacted to films and an interactive seminar, several cognitive and affective questions, the technical quality of the broadcast and interest in future programs. At both sessions, the films were rated between good and very good although the films presented in the second session received the higher ratings. The major criticisms of the first film were that it should have had more depth and that abusive parents other than young females should have been represented. Both seminars were rated between good and very good. Comments indicated that the panel was well informed and that the questions were well answered.

The ATS-6 system operated with 93% reliability during the first session with one site reporting low audio strength. During the second session, the reliability was 77% with one site reporting audio difficulty, one reporting video difficulty, and one reporting both audio and video difficulties.

The needs assessment information indicated a strong interest in additional programs in human resource areas although most participants were not interested in receiving college credit. The majority of participants preferred that workshops be offered in the afternoons.

Bibliography

Gil, D.G. Violence Against Children. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press and the Commonwealth Fund, 1970.

Martin, H.P., Beezley, P., Conway, E.F., and Kempe, C.H. The Development of Abused Children. In Advances in Pediatrics, Schulman, I. (ed.) Vol. 21, Chicago Year Book Medical Publishers, 1974.

(Both cited in Public Health Currents, Ross Laboratories, Columbus, Ohio, May 1975, Vol. 2, no. 1.)

DIAGNOSTIC AND PRESCRIPTIVE READING INSTRUCTION: "FOLLOW-UP"

August 2, 1977

Lea J. Perritt

The Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction (DPRI) course, K-6, has been offered three times and served approximately 700 persons since its development in 1974. In order to provide a forum, via the live seminar, wherein teachers who have tried to implement DPRI concepts might find answers to questions that may have arisen in their classrooms, this Reading Workshop was presented. It was designed as a way to "keep in touch" in order that maximum benefit might be gained from the DPRI course in the form of increased confidence, understanding, and use of DPRI techniques.

Format of the Workshop

The workshop included an interactive seminar and distribution of printed materials.

The participants were given an opportunity to direct questions for one hour and a half to panel members located in the University of Kentucky Television Studios in Lexington, Kentucky. The seminar was produced by AESP's Media Services Component in the University of Kentucky Television Studios. The panel was comprised of the following persons:

Ms. Bernedine Friend, Elementary teacher from Accident, Maryland

Dr. Lowell Eberwein, University of Kentucky Education Department

The panel was moderated by Dr. John Taylor, East Tennessee State University.

During the seminar, participants could submit questions via teletype or telephone.

Each participant also received printed material designed to supplement the material presented in the television program.

At the end of the seminar, the site monitors collected an evaluation form that each participant completed which provided information concerning the background characteristics of viewers, their reactions to the interactive seminar, and their reaction to the technical quality of the presentation.

The participants also responded to several questions designed to measure the attainment of specific objectives and to several questions designed to ascertain their interest in future programs related to reading instruction. This information forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

The participants consisted of 74 persons who watched the program at 14 AESP sites. The frequency of pariticipants by site is presented in Table 14 and the characteristics of the group are presented in Table 15.

Based on those who responded to the sex item, the audience consisted of 89% females. Based on those who responded to the community item, 78% of the participants were employed primarily in rural areas. The participants were most likely to hold positions as elementary school teachers.

Reaction to the Interactive Seminar

The audience was asked to react to the seminar moderator and participants and to the answers they received during the seminar. They also reacted to the pace of the program and provided their overall evaluation of the seminar. The majority of the respondents (69%) thought the moderator was fine. The most frequent suggestion for improvement was that the moderator should have kept the seminar moving at a faster pace so more questions could be answered. The majority also thought the answers they received were fine (53%). The most frequent recommendations for improvement

TABLE 14

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE
DPRI WORKSHOP

AESP Sites	Frequency
Huntsville, AL	9
Rainsville, AL	7
Guntersville, AL	10
LaFollette, TN	6
Tazewell, TN	4
Johnson City, TN	5
Norton, VA	3
Stickleyville, VA	1
Boone, NC	2
Cumberland, MD	9
McHenry, MD	9
Keyser, WV	0
Fredonia, NY	4
Olean, NY	5
Total	74

were more frequent use of specific examples and more direct answers to questions. The respondents were not so favorable towards the seminar participants with less than half (48%) agreeing that the panel members were fine. The most frequent suggestion for improvement was the use of more teachers as guests. It was also suggested that the guest teacher have a broader range of teaching experience.

TABLE 15

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS
DPRI WORKSHOP

Characteristics	Frequency
Sex	
Female	64
Male	8
No response	2
Community in which they work	
Rural	56
Urban	12
Suburban	4
No response	2
Position held during the 1976-77 academic year	
Principal	2
Elementary school teacher	35
Middle school teacher	4
Senior high school teacher	2
Counselor	2
Reading specialist	9
Other	15
No response	5

Dr. Eberwein was the moderator for the seminars which occurred during the DPRI course. During this workshop, he played the role of a panelist. The respondents were fairly evenly divided on whether they preferred him as a moderator or panelist. Thirty-one percent indicated they preferred him as a panelist, 25% preferred him as a moderator, and 43% said it did not make a difference to them. The comments suggested that he was effective in each role. The majority of the respondents (63%) felt the pace of the program was alright, however a significant portion of the audience (36%) thought it was somewhat fast or too fast.

The participants rated the overall value of the seminar as very good (average rating of 2.14).

Participants were generally enthusiastic about the follow-up as indicated by these representative responses:

"an excellent idea to have a follow-up"

"build in a seminar following a final"

"This was an excellent course, one of the best I ever had"

"I have enjoyed a review and .... was pleased at what I remembered"

"There is a real need for follow-up programs such as this where teachers share concerns"

Attainment of Objectives

Several specific objectives were defined for this program. These were that the participants should be able to:

1. Demonstrate increased confidence in using DPRI techniques;
2. Demonstrate an improved understanding of DPRI techniques;
3. Demonstrate an increased likelihood of implementing DPRI techniques in the classroom.

The first objective, demonstrating increased confidence in using DPRI techniques, was measured by asking participants whether they felt more confident about using DPRI techniques in their classrooms as a result of participating in the workshop. Of those responding, 69% moderately or strongly agreed that they felt more confident.

The second objective, demonstrating an improved understanding of DPRI techniques was measured by two items: 82% of the respondents moderately or strongly agreed that their understanding of DPRI techniques improved as a result of the workshop and 63% moderately or strongly agreed that many questions they had about utilizing DPRI techniques were answered by participating in the workshop.

The third objective, demonstrating an increased likelihood of implementing DPRI techniques in their classroom, was measured by asking how likely it was they would utilize DPRI techniques. Of those responding, 35% indicated they already knew or were using the skills, 48% indicated that as a result of the workshop they planned to use DPRI techniques, and 12% indicated the techniques were not relevant to their particular situation. This last group may include principals, administrators, and others not directly involved in teaching.

Technical Aspects

AESP site monitors rated the technical functioning of the equipment used in the program, and participants rated the quality of the reception of the audio and video signals during the program. The site monitors' ratings of the equipment functioning are presented in Table 16. The ATS-6 system operated with a reliability of 100% (no malfunctions reported).

Overall, the site monitors rated the video reception as having imperceptible distortion. The AESP participants rated the clarity of the picture received as between very good and excellent (average rating of 1.56). The site monitors rated the quality of the sound as readable with practically no difficulty and the signal strength as good to very good. The AESP participants rated the quality of the sound received as very good (average rating of 1.96).

Questions were submitted by teletype or telephone during this workshop. Only one site, Rainsville, AL, reported any difficulties in transmitting questions. The teletype would not transmit tapes and the telephone would not receive calls. They were able to call out, however.

TABLE 16

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING
DPRI WORKSHOP

	Site	ATS-6 System	
		Video	Audio
10	Huntsville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3
11	Rainsville, AL*	- - -	3 x 2
12	Guntersville, AL	4 x 4	3 x 3
15	LaFollette, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3
16	Tazewell, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3
17	Johnson City, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3
20	Norton, VA	5 x 5	3 x 3
21	Stickleyville, VA	5 x 5	3 x 3
22	Boone, NC**	- - -	- - -
25	Cumberland, MD	5 x 5	3 x 3
26	McHenry, MD*	- - -	- - -
27	Keyser, WV	5 x 5	3 x 3
35	Fredonia, NY	5 x 5	3 x 3
36	Olean, NY	5 x 5	3 x 3

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signals
2. Faint signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

*Incomplete reports received
**Equipment report not received

Needs Assessment Information

AESP is interested in continued evaluation and development of the DPRI program. Therefore, participants were asked to provide input that would help determine the specific topics to be addressed in future programs. They were asked to respond to a number of topics in terms of their interest in attending future workshops on each topic. The topics listed were based on the topics of interest listed in a follow-up study of participants in the Spring 1975 DPRI course.

The participants were asked to respond to the topics using a scale of 1 to 5 from great interest to no interest. The results of the ratings are presented in Table 17.

The fact that all but two topics were rated above average indicates a strong interest in general in topics related to reading instruction. The topics of classroom management and underachievers in reading were among the most frequently mentioned topics in the follow-up study mentioned previously, which suggests that these two topics would be appropriate for consideration as future programs. Use of tests was also mentioned frequently as a possible topic in the earlier study. Although participants indicated a moderate interest in this topic, it was not among the highest.

Participants were also asked to indicate their interest in workshops using national experts in reading as panelists. The results are presented in Table 18. Although, at least average interest was indicated in all of the experts proposed as panelists, there was no strong interest in any.

The participants also indicated whether they knew who the expert mentioned was. These results are presented in Table 19. In each case, a significant number of the participants could not identify the expert listed. This may suggest a general lack of familiarity with the theoretical aspects of reading instruction.

TABLE 17

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
DPRI WORKSHOPS

Item	Average Rating
Motivation	1.51
Comprehension skills	1.52
Classroom management	1.60
Underachievers in reading	1.62
Reading programs for gifted children	1.69
How to individualize a large class	1.70
Learning disabilities	1.76
Directed reading activities	1.93
Devising games and activities	2.00
Management of DPRI	2.00
Discipline in the classroom	2.04
Reading awareness	2.16
Use of tests	2.26
Reading readiness	2.29
Managing the handicapped child	2.30
Reluctant readers in social studies or science	2.38
Research about how children learn	2.41
Appreciation of children's literature	2.45
Reading programs for the culturally different child	2.63
Standardized tests	2.67
Contingency contracting	2.87
Reading programs on 4th grade level	3.01
Miscue inventory	3.13

TABLE 18

RANK ORDERING OF INTEREST IN READING EXPERTS AS PANELISTS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
DPRI WORKSHOP

Topic	Average Rating
Harold Herber discussing study skills and content field reading	1.86
Edgar Dale discussing vocabulary	2.02
Delores Durkin discussing beginning reading	2.16
Albert Harris discussing research on reading	2.33
Wayne Otto discussing DPRI	2.34
Ken Goodman discussing the Miscue Reading Inventory	2.74

TABLE 19

RANK ORDERING OF EXPERTS IN READING BY PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS NOT FAMILIAR WITH THEM
DPRI WORKSHOP

Expert	% not knowing who person is
Wayne Otto	38%
Harold Herber	37%
Albert Harris	37%
Ken Goodman	31%
Edgar Dale	31%
Delores Durkin	29%

Conclusions

74 people at 14 AESP sites participated in the reading workshop. The majority of the group were females and worked in a rural community. All of the participants were education personnel with the greatest number employed as elementary school teachers. The participants reacted to an interactive seminar, several questions designed to measure attainment of objectives, the technical quality of the broadcast, and possible topics for future programs.

The seminar was rated as very good. Recommendations for improvement included moving at a faster pace, using examples more frequently, and using more direct answers to questions. Participants also suggested using guests representing a wider variety of teaching areas on the panel. The ATS-6 system operated with 100% reliability and all but one site could transmit questions by teletype.

In relation to the objectives, the majority of the participants agreed that their understanding of and confidence in using DPRI techniques had improved as a result of the workshop, and that the likelihood that they would use the techniques had increased.

The needs assessment information indicated interest in future programs in nearly all areas of reading instruction.

CARDIOVASCULAR PHYSICAL ASSESSMENT: "OVERVIEW" AND "HEART SOUNDS, PRESSURES, AND PULSES"

August 9 and August 16, 1977

Lea J. Perritt

The primary purpose of this two-part series on cardiovascular physical assessment was to create an understanding of the skills and techniques utilized by nursing professionals in history taking and physical assessment of the cardiovascular patient.

By emphasizing the practical application of techniques used in physical assessment, the nursing professional can increase both his/her confidence and competence in performing history taking and physical examination for the cardiovascular patient. Intended for registered nurses, nursing practitioners, clinical specialists, and educators involved in curriculum development of nursing programs, this workshop focused on the recognition of cardinal cardiovascular symptoms, the essential components involved in physical assessment, and the nurse's and physician's roles in history taking and physical assessment.

Format of the Workshops

The workshop consisted of two sessions which included presentation of audio- and videotapes, interactive seminars, and distribution of printed materials.

In the first session, a portion of a film entitled "Assessment of the Cardiovascular System" which was developed by Dallas Area Hospital Television System was broadcast from the University of Kentucky television studios over AESP's ATS-6 satellite system. This videotape presented the essential components of history taking for cardiovascular patients and gave an overview and demonstration of the utilization of techniques involved in physical assessment of the cardiovascular patient.

In the second session, portions of two tapes entitled "Pressures and Pulses" and "Peripheral Vascular System" which are included in the Bates series developed by J.B. Lippincott Company were broadcast. These videotapes covered heart sounds, physiology, pulses and pressures, and the peripheral vascular system. An audiotape developed by Dallas Area Hospital Television System entitled "Heart Sounds #5" was also broadcast. This tape presented actual heart sounds, both normal and abnormal and was followed by a quiz on heart sounds.

At the completion of the tapes, participants were given an opportunity to direct questions concerning the content of the presented material to panel members located in the television studios in Lexington, Kentucky. The seminar was produced by AESP's Media Services Component in the University of Kentucky Television Studios. The panel for the first session was comprised of the following persons:

Susan Wright, R.N., M.S., Cardiovascular Clinical Specialist,
Dallas Veterans Administration Hospital, Texas

Dr. Bill Harris, Chief Medical Resident, Cardiology Fellow,
Albert B. Chandler Medical Center, Lexington, Kentucky

The panel for the second session was comprised of Dr. Harris and Carolyn Veolker, ICU and CCU Clinical Instructor, Certified Critical Care Nurse, Jewish Hospital, Louisville, Kentucky.

The panels at both sessions were moderated by Penny Bamford, R.N., M.S., Cardiovascular Clinical Specialist, University of Kentucky, College of Nursing.

During the interactive seminar, participants could submit questions in one of three ways: 1) 5 of the AESP sites were equipped to transmit questions via the ATS-3 VHF system; 2) all of the AESP sites were equipped to transmit questions via teletype at the first session and 10 at the second session, and 3) all sites could transmit questions via telephone at each session.

At the end of each session, the site monitors collected an evaluation form that each participant completed which provided information concerning the background characteristics of viewers, their reactions to the tapes and interactive seminars, and their perception of the technical quality of the presentations. The participants also responded to several questions designed to measure the attainment of specific objectives, and to several questions designed to ascertain their interest in future nursing care programs. This information forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

The analysis of participant reaction was conducted separately for the two sessions. The first session consisted of 168 persons who watched the program at 16 AESP sites. The second session consisted of 130 persons who watched the program at 14 sites. The frequency of participants by site for each session is presented in Table 20 and the characteristics of each of these groups is presented in Table 21.

The two audiences are similar along the dimensions of sex, position in which presently employed, and highest degree attained. In both sessions, 93% of the participants were female. The largest number of participants (42 to 43%)were employed in staff positions with the next largest number (18 to 19%) in supervisory or administrative capacities. In regard to highest degree attained, between 51 and 56% held diplomas in nursing and 18% had associate degrees. The two groups differed slightly with respect to community in which they work, age, and years experience in nursing. Those who worked in rural communities made up a greater proportion of the audience for the second session (62%) than they did

TABLE 20

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE AND SESSION
CARDIOVASCULAR PHYSICAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHOPS

AESP Sites	Session I	Session II
Huntsville, AL	1	3
Rainsville, AL	9	7
Guntersville, AL	4	8
Rome, GA	17	8
LaFollette, TN	3	---
Tazewell, TN	14	7
Johnson City, TN	8	2
Norton, VA	9	13
Stickleyville, VA	8	4
Cumberland, MD	34	23
McHenry, MD	10	12
Goddard, WV*	1	3
Keyser, WV	7	11
Altona, PA	12	---
Fredonia, NY	19	21
Olean, NY	12	7
Edinboro, PA	1	4
Total	169 (168)	133 (130)

*Goddard participants represented consultants for grant review rather than nursing personnel and therefore are not included in this report.

TABLE 21

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS BY SESSION
CARDIOVASCULAR PHYSICAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHOPS

Characteristics	Session I		Session II	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Sex				
Female	157	93	121	93
Male	11	7	3	2
No response	0		6	5
Community in which they work				
Rural	91	54	80	62
Urban	57	34	32	25
Suburban	20	12	12	9
No response	0		6	5
Position in which presently employed				
Staff position	73	43	55	42
Supervisory	30	18	25	19
Clinical specialist	3	2	2	2
Office nurse	2	1	3	2
School nurse	10	6	8	6
Nursing educator	17	10	9	7
Other	29	17	25	19
No response	4	2	3	2
Age				
20 or below	2	1	1	1
21 - 30	63	37	36	28
31 - 40	38	23	40	31
41 - 50	35	21	33	25
51 or over	29	17	15	12
No response	1	1	5	4
Highest degree attained				
Baccalaureate degree in nursing	22	13	14	11
Associate degree	30	18	24	18
Master's degree in nursing	7	4	4	3
Diploma in nursing	86	51	73	56
Other	23	14	12	9
No response	0		3	2

TABLE 21--CONTINUED

Characteristics	Session I		Session II	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Years of experience in nursing				
1 year or less	19	11	10	8
2 - 5 years	40	24	24	18
6 - 10 years	24	14	24	18
11 - 15 years	22	13	20	15
16 years or more	58	35	44	34
No response	5	3	8	6

for the first (54%). Conversely, those who worked in urban communities, made up a larger proportion of the audience for the first session (34%) than they did for the second (25%). In regard to age, the greatest number of participants in the first session (37%) were between 21 and 30 years old and in the second session, the greatest number of participants (31%) were between 31 and 40 years of age. In both sessions, however, the majority of the participants (58 to 60%) were between 21 and 40 years of age. In regard to years of experience in nursing the greatest number of participants (34 to 35%) had 16 or more years of experience. There were more in the first session than in the second, however, that had 5 or less years experience (35% compared to 26%).

Reaction to the Tapes

The participants were asked to rate the tapes, described earlier in this report, according to their difficulty level, vocabulary level, and amount, accuracy, and pace of information presented. They also rated the usefulness, interest value, and overall value of the tapes. Difficulty level and

vocabulary level could be rated as too difficult, about right or too simple. The difficulty level was rated as "about right" by 86% of the respondents at the first session and by 78% of the respondents at the second session. The vocabulary level was rated as "about right" by 96% of the respondents at the first session and 92% of the respondents at the second session. The pace used to present information could be rated as too fast, about right, or too slow.

Only 44% of the respondents at the first session rated the pace used to present information as "about right" while 54% of the respondents rated it as "too fast." At the second session, only 45% of the respondents rated the pace as "about right" while 55% rated it as "too fast".

Amount of information presented could be rated as too much, about right, or too little. The amount of information presented was rated as "about right" by 68% of the respondents at both the first and second sessions. Accuracy of information presented, usefulness, and interest value were rated on the following scale: 1 - strongly agree, 2 - moderately agree, 3 - neutral, 4 - moderately disagree, 5 - strongly disagree. Participants at both sessions averaged between moderately agree and strongly agree (average ratings = 1.51 and 1.49 respectively) that information was accurate. Both audiences also agreed that the information provided was useful to them, although the participants at the second session agreed more strongly (average ratings = 1.92 and 1.69 respectively). Both groups moderately agreed that the information was presented in an interesting manner (average ratings = 2.01 and 1.87 respectively).

Overall value was indicated on the following scale: 1 - excellent, 2 - very good, 3 - good, 4 - fair, 5 - poor. The groups rated the overall value of the taped programs as very good (average ratings = 1.96 and 2.22 respectively).

The comments made by the participants give some indications why the tapes, although rated favorably, were not rated higher. Participants at the first session criticized the tape for going too fast and using words that were too technical. They also suggested that more illustrations were needed and that the tape was too long. At the second session the criticisms were mainly regarding the audio tape which presented heart sounds. The participants felt that it was difficult to clearly hear the differences in the sounds and that each sound should have been presented for a longer period of time. The video tapes viewed during the second session were rated as much more interesting and useful than those viewed during the first session.

Reaction to the Interactive Seminars

The participants were asked to react to the seminar moderator, the answer they received during the seminar, and the pace of the seminar, They were also asked to provide their overall evaluation of the seminar. The majority of the respondents at the first session (73%) and the second session (68%) felt the moderator was fine. The most frequent recommendation for improvement at both sessions was that she should have provided summary statements occasionally.

The majority of the respondents at both sessions thought that the answers to the questions were fine (53% and 59% respectively). The most frequent recommendation for improvement was that specific examples be used more frequently. At the first session, they also thought the questions could have been answered more directly.

While the majority of respondents at both sessions thought the pace of the seminars was about right (68% and 71% respectively), a significant number felt it was too fast (16% and 28% respectively).

Overall the seminars were rated as very good by both groups (average ratings = 2.37 and 2.145 respectively). Both groups also moderately agreed that the workshops provided them with information they needed to perform their jobs more effectively (average ratings = 2.03 and 1.84 respectively).

Attainment of Objectives

Several specific objects were defined for these programs. These were:

A. Workshop #1 - The participants should be able to:
   1. Recognize appropriate procedures for history taking;
   2. Recognize essential components of a physical examination for cardiovascular patients;
   3. Demonstrate increased confidence in ability to perform a physical examination on a cardiovascular patient and history taking;
   4. Demonstrate increased competence in ability to perform history taking and a physical examination for the cardiovascular patient.

B. Workshop #2 - The participants should be able to:
   1. Recognize normal and abnormal heart sounds;
   2. Identify body locations of pulses and pressures and recognize normal pulses and pressures;
   3. Recognize normal and abnormal characteristics of the vascular system.

In regard to the first objective, recognizing appropriate procedures for history taking, 59% of the respondents recognized all 5 of the correct procedures listed, 86% recognized at least 4; 91% at least 3, 92% at least 2, and 93% at least 1 procedure. 57% of the respondents, however, checked the incorrect response "vital signs." This is possibly due to the fact that this answer is appropriate as part of physical assessment and since history taking and physical assessment were presented together in the film the participants did not make a clear-cut distinction between history

taking and physical examination.

In regard to the second objective, recognizing essential components of a physical examination, 67% of the respondents correctly identified all 6 components, 78% identified at least 5 components, 90% identified at least 4, 93% identified at least 3, 97% identified at least 2, and all respondents identified at least one component correctly. In regard to the third objective, demonstrating increased confidence in ability to perform a physical examination and history taking, 64% of the respondents agreed that they felt more confident about their ability to take a history and 58% agreed that they felt more confident about their ability to perform a physical examination. These ratings may be due to the relatively fast pace of the tape and the lack of more illustrations. On the average, the participants moderately agreed that they felt more confident in taking a history (average rating = 2.26) and in performing a physical examination (average rating = 2.38).

The fourth objective, demonstrating increased competence in ability to perform a physical exam and history taking,was measured through a self-assessment item on the questionnaire completed at the end of the second session. Since some participants did not attend the second session this objective cannot be evaluated for the entire group. This limits the conclusions which can be drawn as to whether this objective was achieved. Of the 73 participants responding to this item, 38% indicated they had an opportunity to practice the skills they learned in the first workshop. Of those who had the opportunity to practice the skills, 72% felt that they had been provided enough information to perform competently. Suggestions for improvement included providing more details on how to perform the skills and an opportunity to actually practice the skills during the workshop. The

majority of those who practiced the skills performed physical assessments, history taking, and auscultation. Those who indicated they did not have an opportunity to practice the skills gave three main reasons: being on vacation, being to busy with work related duties, not having patients available in their position.

The fifth objective, recognizing normal and abnormal heart sounds, was measured by asking participants to listen to heart sounds and indicate whether they were normal or abnormal. Sound number one was correctly identified as normal by 91% of the respondents, sound number two was correctly identified as normal by only 49% of the respondents, sound number three was identified correctly as abnormal by 72% of the respondents, and sound number four was correctly identified as abnormal by 87.5% of the respondents. The comments indicated that the sounds were not always clear or played long enough, which may have accounted for some of the difficulty in correctly identifying sounds two and three.

Objective six, identifying body location of pulses and pressures and recognizing normal pulses and pressures, was measured by asking participants to identify the location of and label the pulses and pressures on a drawing of the human body. Fourteen percent of the respondents correctly identified all eight pulses and pressures, 41% correctly identified at least seven, 71% were able to identify at least six, 89% could identify at least five, 96% identified at least 4 correctly, 99% identified at least 3 correctly, 99% identified at least 2 correctly, and all identified at least one. The two most frequently missed were jugular and tibial.

In regard to the last objective, recognizing normal and abnormal characteristics of the vascular system, 28% were able to identify at least 3 correct characteristics, 44% could identify at least 2 characteristics, and 90% could identify at least one characteristic. Twenty-two percent of the respondents marked the incorrect response "lungs" and 15% the incorrect response "abdomen."

Technical Aspects

AESP site monitors rated the technical functioning of the equipment used in the program, and participants rated the quality of the audio and video signals during the program. The site monitors' ratings of the equipment functioning are presented in Table 22. During the first session the ATS-6 system operated with a reliability of 81% (3 malfunctions out of 14 sites reporting). The malfunctions occurred at Norton, VA, Fredonia, NY, and Olean, NY. In Norton, the satellite was out of position resulting in a poor quality picture and sound. Also, they had no color during the first half of the program. In Fredonia, the video was very poor during the first half hour of the program but then improved. In Olean, a 15 minute delay was experienced in receiving both the audio and video portions of the program. During the second session, only 1 out of 14 sites reported difficulty. This was at Norton, WV where the H.P receiver malfunctioned resulting in poor picture and sound. The problem was apparently caused by lightening. Overall, the site monitors rated the video reception as having between no and barely perceptible distortion. They also rated the objectionableness of the distortion between "not annoying" and "slightly annoying." The average rating of the clarity of the picture was between very good and good. The site monitors rated

TABLE 22

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF ATS-6 SYSTEM
CARDIOVASCULAR PHYSICAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHOPS

	Site	Session I		Session II	
		Video	Audio	Video	Audio
10	Huntsville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
11	Rainsville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
12	Guntersville, AL	4 x 4	3 x 3	4 x 4	3 x 3
14	Rome, GA	5 x 5	3 x 2	5 x 5	3 x 1
15	LaFollette, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3	- - -	- - -*
16	Tazewell, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
17	Johnson City, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
20	Norton, VA	4 x 4	2 x 2	3 x 3	2 x 1
21	Stickleyville, VA	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
25	Cumberland, MD	3 x 3	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
26	McHenry, MD	3 x 3	2 x 2	5 x 5	3 x 3
27	Keyser, WV	- - -	- - -*	5 x 5	3 x 3
35	Fredonia, NY	4 x 4	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
36	Olean, NY	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
37	Edinboro, PA	- - -	- - -*	- - -	- - -*

*Equipment report not received

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty, or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signals
2. Fair signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

the quality of the sound as generally readable with little or no difficulty and the signal strength as being good to very good. The AESP participants rated the quality of the sound received between very good and good.

During the first session, the teletype was inoperative at Rainsville, During the second session, 3 sites could not transmit questions on the teletype. These were Rainsville, Fredonia, and Olean. In addition, Rainsville's telephone was inoperative. The New York sites reported severe weather as the cause of their difficulties.

Needs Assessment Information

AESP is interested in offering more programs on topics related to nursing. Therefore, participants were asked to provide input to help determine the specific topics related to nursing which could possibly be developed into future programs. They were asked to respond to a number of topics in terms of their interest in participating in a program on each topic using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 indicated great interest and 5 indicated no interest.

The results of the ratings by the AESP group are presented in Tables 23 and 24. Nearly all of the items were rated as average to above average interest (30 out of 32 in session one and 32 out of 32 in session two). This indicates this group is very interested in general in nursing care topics. The strongest interests are in all aspects of nursing care for adults and respiratory nursing care for all age groups. The least interest, although still average, in the areas of obstetrics and gynocology and nursing care for infants. The results of these ratings are presented in Tables 25, 26, and 27.

TABLE 23

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
CARDIOVASCULAR PHYSICAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP I

Item	Average Rating
Respiratory nursing care for adults	1.54
Neurological nursing for adults	1.81
Renal nursing care for adults	1.81
Gastro-intestinal nursing care for adults	1.83
Respiratory nursing care for geriatrics	2.03
Renal nursing care for geriatrics	2.17
Orthopedic nursing care for adults	2.19
Gastro-intestinal nursing care for geriatrics	2.29
Respiratory nursing care for adolescents	2.30
Respiratory nursing care for infants	2.36
Renal nursing care for adolescents	2.37
Respiratory nursing care for school age children	2.41
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care for adults	2.42
Neurological nursing for geriatrics	2.46
Orthopedic nursing care for geriatrics	2.55
Renal nursing care for school age children	2.60
Gastro-intestinal nursing care for adolescents	2.65
Neurological nursing for adolescents	2.67
Orthopedic nursing care for adolescents	2.69
Renal nursing care for infants	2.70
Orthopedic nursing care for school age children	2.74

TABLE 23--CONTINUED

Item	Average Rating
Obstetrics and gynocological system nursing care for female	2.75
Neurological nursing for infants	2.76
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care for school age children	2.84
Neurological nursing for school age children	2.84
Gastro-intestinal nursing care for infants	2.86
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care for geriatrics	2.88
Gastro-intestinal nursing care for school age children	2.90
Orthopedic nursing care for infants	2.94
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care for infants	2.99
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care for adolescents	3.01
Obstetrics and gynocological system nursing care for male	3.19

TABLE 24

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
CARDIOVASCULAR PHYSICAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP II

Item	Average Rating
Renal nursing care for adults	1.55
Respiratory nursing care for adults	1.73
Gastro-intestinal nursing care for adults	1.94
Respiratory nursing care for geriatrics	1.98
Renal nursing care for geriatrics	2.04
Gastro-intestinal nursing care for geriatrics	2.04
Neurological nursing for adults	2.09
Orthopedic nursing care for adults	2.09
Respiratory nursing care for school age children	2.17
Respiratory nursing care for adolescents	2.24
Respiratory nursing care for infants	2.30
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care for adults	2.31
Orthopedic nursing care for adolescents	2.31
Obstetrics and gynocological system nursing care for female	2.32
Renal nursing care for school age children	2.34
Orthopedic nursing care for geriatrics	2.35
Renal nursing care for adolescents	2.38
Gastro-intestinal nursing care for adolescents	2.39
Neurological nursing for geriatrics	2.40
Renal nursing care for infants	2.44
Neurological nursing for adolescents	2.44

TABLE 24--CONTINUED

Item	Average Rating
Orthopedic nursing care for school age children	2.48
Gastro-intestinal nursing care for school age children	2.48
Neurological nursing for school age children	2.52
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care for school age children	2.53
Gastro-intestinal nursing care for infants	2.59
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care for geriatrics	2.61
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care for adolescents	2.66
Neurological nursing for infants	2.68
Obstetrics and gynocological system nursing care for male	2.88
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care for infants	2.90
Orthopedic nursing care for infants	2.95

TABLE 25

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
BY MEDICAL SPECIALITY
CARDIOVASCULAR PHYSICAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP I

Item	Average Rating
Respiratory nursing care	2.10
Renal nursing care	2.30
Gastro-intestinal nursing care	2.47
Neurological nursing	2.49
Orthopedic nursing care	2.61
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care	2.82
Obstetrics and gynocology nursing care	2.95

TABLE 26

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
BY MEDICAL SPECIALITY
CARDIOVASCULAR PHYSICAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP II

Item	Average Rating
Respiratory nursing care	2.07
Renal nursing care	2.09
Gastro-intestinal nursing care	2.28
Neurological nursing	2.42
Orthopedic nursing care	2.43
Ear, nose, and throat nursing care	2.56
Obstetrics and gynocology nursing care	2.60

TABLE 27

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
BY PATIENT GROUP
CARDIOVASCULAR PHYSICAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHOPS

Item	Average Rating	
	Session I	Session II
Adults	1.92	1.92
Geriatrics	2.39	2.23
Adolescents	2.62	2.40
School age children	2.72	2.42
Infants	2.76	2.64

In relation to the time courses should be offered, appropriate credit, and fees, the participants at the two sessions responded similarly. The majority of the respondents (64% and 62% respectively) felt CEU credit should be given for similar workshops. Approximately one fourth of the respondents thought either undergraduate or graduate college credit should be offered. The majority of the participants at both sessions indicated they would be willing to pay a small fee in order to participate in a course (80% and 77% respectively). In regard to the most convenient time to offer a course, at the first session, 50% preferred afternoon courses and 37% evening courses. Tuesday was preferred by 43% of the respondents, with Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday the next most preferred days. Friday, Saturday, and Sunday were least preferred. Fifty-five percent of the participants indicated that they preferred a course that met 2 hours once a week for 15 weeks rather than 3 hours a week for 10 weeks or 1 hour twice a week for 15 weeks.

At the second session, 56% of the participants indicated they preferred afternoon classes and 43% indicated a preference for evening classes. Again Tuesday was preferred by 43% of the respondents with Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday the next most preferred days. Fifty-two percent of the participants indicated a preference for a course that met two hours once a week for 15 weeks.

Conclusions

168 persons participated in session one and 130 persons participated in session two of a two-part workshop in cardiovascular physical assessment. The participants reacted to the tapes and interactive seminars, several cognitive questions, the technical quality of the broadcast, and topics for future programs.

For both sessions the tapes were rated overall as very good. The major criticisms were that the pace was too fast and that too much information was presented .

The seminars were rated as very good for both sessions. The most frequent recommendations for improvement were the use of more specific examples and summary statements by the moderator.

The ATS-6 system operated with a reliability of 77% during the first session and 93% during the second session.

The needs assessment information indicated a strong interest in future nursing care programs particularly for adults and respiratory conditions.

HOME ENERGY CONSERVATION: "PART I" AND "PART II"

August 30 and September 6, 1977

Lea J. Perritt

The record-breaking cold spell of last winter created an increased awareness of the need to conserve energy. The public was reminded that energy supplies are limited and potentially exhaustable and that the fuel shortages experienced last year are likely to continue. Energy conservation became a national priority and the public was encouraged to make it a personal priority. Persons were asked to lower their thermostats and increase insulation in their homes in order to conserve fuel.

Homeowners, however, often lack specific information on what measures they can take to make their homes more energy efficient. Many, for example, do not know how to determine what type and how much insulation is most cost effective or how to actually install insulation.

In order to provide information on specific techniques for properly "winterizing" a home, AESP offered two workshops on energy conservation. These workshops were directed primarily at the homeowner and focused on how to cut fuel costs through proper methods of insulating and ventilating all parts of the home.

Format of the Workshops

The workshops consisted of two sessions which each included presentation of videotapes, an interactive seminar, and distribution of printed materials.

In the first session, two 22-minute videotapes, which were developed by the Chautauqua County Energy Office in conjunction with the Chautauqua County Board of Cooperative Educational Services, were broadcast from the University of Kentucky television studios over AESP's ATS-6 satellite system.

The films, entitled "Ventilation and Insulation" and "Attics: Insulation and Ventilation", discussed why and where to insulate for each part of the home, provided an assessment and demonstration of insulation materials available, and made specific recommendations for attic insulation and ventilation.

In the second session, two 22-minute videotapes, also developed by the Chautauqua County Energy Office, were presented. The films, entitled "Insulating Side Walls and Basements" and "Weatherstripping", focused on insulating low grade areas and weatherstripping of doors and windows.

At the completion of the videotapes, the participants were given an opportunity to direct questions concerning the content of the presented material to panel members located in the television studios in Lexington, Kentucky. These seminars were produced by AESP's Media Services Component in the University of Kentucky Television Studios. The panel for both sessions was comprised of the following persons:

Dr. Leland Gallup, Housing Specialist of the Cornell University Extension Service

Mr. Thomas C. Duro, Energy Information Coordinator of the Chautauqua County Energy Office in Fredonia, New York

Mr. Bob Cusick, Area Energy Specialist in Missouri

Dr. Gallup was moderator at both sessions.

During the interactive seminars, participants could submit questions in one of three ways: 1) 5 of the AESP sites were equipped to transmit questions via the ATS-3 VHF system; 2) all of the AESP sites were equipped to transmit questions via teletype, and 3) all sites could transmit questions via telephone.

Each participant also received printed material designed to supplement the material presented in the television program.

At the end of each seminar, the site monitors collected an evaluation form that each participant completed which provided information concerning the background characteristics of viewers, their reactions to the films and interactive seminars, and their perception of the technical quality of the presentations. The participants also responded to several questions designed to measure the attainment of specific cognitive objectives. This information forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

The analysis of participant reaction was conducted separately for the two sessions. The first session consisted of 62 persons who watched the program at 11 AESP sites. The second session consisted of 48 persons who watched the program at 9 AESP sites. The frequency of participants by site for each session is presented in Table 28 and the characteristics of each of these groups is presented in Table 29.

The two audiences differed somewhat along the dimensions of sex, community in which they work, and occupation. Based on those who responded to the sex item, the number of males decreased from session one to session two (from 47 to 33) while the number of females remained about the same. At both sessions, however, the majority of the audience were males (76% and 69% respectively). Based on those who responded to the community item, the participants who worked primarily in urban areas decreased from session one to session two (23 to 13) while those who worked primarily in suburban areas increased somewhat (7 to 11). Based on the occupation item, educators represented the largest number of participants at the first session but showed a decrease at the second session (19 to 8). At both sessions,

TABLE 28

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE AND SESSION
HOME ENERGY CONSERVATION WORKSHOPS

AESP Sites	Session I	Session II
Huntsville, AL	16	11
Rainsville, AL	3	2
Guntersville, AL	8	5
Rome, GA	7	0
Johnson City, TN	1	0
Norton, VA	4	2
Cumberland, MD	3	3
McHenry, MD	0	3
Keyser, WV	2	0
Fredonia, NY	5	8
Olean, NY	2	3
Edinboro, NY	11	11
Total	62	48

approximately one fourth of the audience were employed in the building trades as carpenters, engineers, or contractors, and one fourth were employed in areas not directly related to energy conservation such as factory workers or secretaries. These workshops appealed to a rather wide range of individuals with professional as well as personal interests in energy conservation.

TABLE 29

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS BY SESSION
HOME ENERGY CONSERVATION WORKSHOPS

Characteristics	Session I		Session II	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Sex				
Female	15	24%	14	29%
Male	47	76%	33	69%
No response	0	0%	1	2%
Community in which they work				
Rural	26	42%	22	46%
Urban	23	37%	13	27%
Suburban	7	11%	11	23%
Combination	0	0%	1	2%
No response	6	10%	1	2%
Occupation				
Contractors, engineers, Construction personnel	13	21%	13	27%
Educators	19	31%	8	17%
Energy specialists	4	6%	5	10%
Service representatives	5	8%	2	4%
Retired persons	4	6%	3	6%
Other	15	24%	12	25%
No response	2	3%	5	10%

Reaction to the Films

The participants were asked to rate the films, described earlier in this report, according to their value as a source of practical information and to rate their overall value. They used the following scale to indicate their responses: 1 - excellent, 2 - very good, 3 - good, 4 - fair, 5 - poor.

As a source of practical information, the films viewed at the first session were rated between very good and excellent (average ratings = 1.57 and 1.53). The ratings were similar for the participants' overall reactions to the films. These ratings were also between very good and excellent (average ratings = 1.53 and 1.66). The ratings at the second session, although above average, were not as high. As a source of practical information, the films were rated as very good (average ratings = 2.13 and 2.17). Overall value was also very good (average ratings = 2.04 and 2.21).

The comments made by the participants suggest that the technical problems in the broadcast may have contributed to the differential ratings at the two sessions. The participants at the second session felt the content was good but that the sound was distorted and that background noises were distracting. They also suggested that at least equal emphasis be given to winterizing older homes. The comments at the first session were more favorable and indicated that the information was well presented, relevant, and practical.

Reaction to the Interactive Seminars

The participants were asked to react to the seminar moderator and to the answers they received during the seminars. They were also asked to provide their overall evaluation of the seminars. The majority of the participants at each session felt that the seminar moderator was fine (92% and 87% respectively). Several respondents at each session, however, felt that providing occasional summary statements would have been helpful.

The majority of the participants at both sessions felt the answers they received from the panelists were fine (75% and 81% respectively). Comments indicated the panel members were well informed and that the questions were interesting although there was some repetition of material presented in the films. The most frequent recommendation for improvement was more frequent use of specific examples.

The overall rating of the seminars was very good (average ratings = 1.82 and 2.02 respectively).

Attainment of Objectives

These programs were designed to meet several specific cognitive objectives. The objectives defined for the two session were:

A. Workshop #1 - The participants should be able to:
   1. Identify why and where to insulate for each part of the home;
   2. Recognize different types of insulation materials and their advantages and disadvantages;
   3. Recognize effective methods for insulating and ventilating an attic.

B. Workshop #2 - The participants should be able to:
   1. Recognize appropriate methods for insulating walls and crawl spaces;
   2. Identify appropriate procedures for weatherstripping doors and windows.

The first objective, identifying why and where to insulate for each part of the home, was measured by two questions in which participants were asked to identify reasons for insulating their homes. All of the participants were able to recognize at least one reason for insulating; 98% identified two reasons and 63% identified all three reasons listed. Participants were also asked to identify reasons ventilation is important. Seventy-seven percent of the participants were able to identify both reasons listed. An additional 11% of the participants identified one item correctly.

The second objective, recognizing different types of insulation materials and their advantages and disadvantages, was measured by means of two true-false items. Eighty-seven percent of the respondents knew that two potential problems associated with plastic foam insulation are shrinkage and lingering fumes and 93% knew that batts and blankets are good types of insulation because they maintain a consistent thickness.

The third objective, recognizing effective methods for insulating and ventilating an attic, was measured by means of two items. Seventy-six percent of the participants knew that attic insulation should extend over the wall plate but should not fill in the entire rafter space and 82% of the participants knew how much ventilation space is necessary for proper ventilation.

The first objective, for the second session, recognizing appropriate methods for insulating walls and crawl spaces, was measured by means of three items. Ninety-one percent of the participants knew that a vapor barrier is necessary when insulating walls. Only 36% of the participants, however, correctly identified rigid insulation as most appropriate for basement insulation because it is nonflammable. Also, only 20% of the participants responded correctly to an item concerning the width of stud spaces in relationship to the size of the vapor barrier. One explanation for these results may be that the items used to measure this objective were somewhat wordy and perhaps difficult to understand. Also, the poor sound quality may have made it more difficult to comprehend the material.

The second objective, identifying appropriate procedures for weather-stripping doors and windows, was measured by means of three items. Seventy-six percent of the participants knew that rigid plastic is more durable

than plastic sheets and 86% of the participants knew that weatherstripping should be applied around the perimeter of all exterior doors and windows. Ninety percent of the participants knew that metal strips are the most functional and durable weatherstripping material.

Overall, the objectives were more successfully achieved for the first session, although the objectives were achieved by the majority of participants for both sessions.

Technical Aspects

AESP site monitors rated the technical functioning of the equipment used in the program, and participants rated the quality of the reception of the audio and video signals during the program. The site monitors' ratings of the equipment functioning are presented in Table 30. The ATS-6 system operated with a reliability of 100% during the first session with no malfunctions reported. At the second session, Norton, VA, McHenry, MD, and Edinboro, NY, reported difficulties. In Norton, the picture varied between excellent and poor throughout the program. McHenry and Edinboro both experienced poor sound quality during the broadcast.

Overall, the site monitors rated the video reception at both sessions as having between no and barely perceptible distortion. They also rated the objectionableness of the distortion as between "not annoying" and "slightly annoying". The average rating of the clarity of the picture received by participants at the first session was between excellent and very good (average rating = 1.47) and the clarity of the picture at the second session was rated very good (average rating = 1.91).

TABLE 30

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING OF ATS-6 SYSTEM
HOME ENERGY CONSERVATION WORKSHOPS

	Site	Session I		Session II	
		Video	Audio	Video	Audio
10	Huntsville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
11	Rainsville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
12	Guntersville, AL	4 x 4	3 x 3	4 x 4	3 x 3
14	Rome, GA	5 x 5	3 x 2	---*	---*
17	Johnson City, TN	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
20	Norton, VA	5 x 5	3 x 3	---**	---**
25	Cumberland, MD	4 x 4	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
26	McHenry, MD	---*	---*	4 x 4	2 x 2
27	Keyser, WV	5 x 5	3 x 3	---*	---*
35	Fredonia, NY	5 x 5	3 x 3	---**	3 x 3
36	Olean, NY	---**	---**	---**	---**
37	Edinboro, NY	---**	---**	4 x 4	3 x 3

*Equipment report not received
**Equipment report not completed

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty, or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signals
2. Fair signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

At both sessions, the site monitors rated the quality of the sound as readable with practically no or no difficulty and the strength of the signal as good to very good. The participants at the first session rated the quality of sound received between excellent and very good (average rating = 1.50). At the second session, the participants rated the quality of the sound between good and very good (average rating = 2.39).

Conclusions

Sixty-two persons participated in session one and 48 persons participated in session two of a two-part workshop in energy conservation. The participants, who were predominately male, represented both rural and urban construction personnel, educators, and homeowners. The participants reacted to several tapes and interactive seminars, several cognitive questions, and the technical quality of the broadcast. The participants at the first session rated the films between very good and excellent and the participants at the second session rated them as very good. The major criticism of the films at the second session was that the sound was distorted and that background noises were distracting. The seminars were rated very good at both sessions. Suggestions for improvement were the use of more specific examples and summary statements by the moderator.

The cognitive objectives for the workshop were achieved by the majority of the participants. Lack of higher achievement of one objective of the second session may have been due to the technical difficulties experienced during the films at several sites.

The ATS-6 system operated with a reliability of 100% at the first session. During the second session, three sites reported malfunctions. These difficulties were apparently due to technical problems in the broadcast rather than equipment malfunctions. The participants, however, were still able to view the programs.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A total of 1228 participants representing 20 AESP sites in 10 states attended a series of nine workshops delivered via satellite during the summer of 1977. The formats of the workshops were similar and included delivery of videotaped materials and live, interactive seminars, distribution of related printed materials, and completion of evaluation instruments.

Overall, the majority of the workshop participants were females, and worked in rural communities, although more males than females attended the energy conservation workshop. School personnel represented the majority of the audiences at the special education and DPRI follow-up workshops, the workshops in cardiovascular physical assessment were attended primarily by nursing personnel, and social workers represented the majority of participants at the child abuse workshops. The home energy conservation workshop included a variety of occupations.

For all the workshops both the videotaped programs and the seminars received overall ratings between "good" and "excellent". For both videotapes and seminars, the highest ratings were received for the first home energy conservation workshop.

The technical quality of the satellite delivered programs generally received acceptable ratings from both participants and site monitors. The clarity of the picture was rated between "very good" and "excellent" by the participants at all programs except the second child abuse workshop where it was rated between "good" and "very good". The sound quality received somewhat lower ratings in general but was still rated between "good" and "very good".

The technical quality was rated highest at the first energy conservation workshop which suggests that quality of audio and video reception may be related to perceived value of the other components of the programs.

Specific cognitive and attitudinal objectives were developed for each workshop. At the completion of each program participants responded to items designed to measure attainment of each objective. Both the cognitive and affective objectives were generally achieved by the majority of participants at all the workshops.

Needs assessment results indicated a strong interest in additional programming in the areas of special education, reading instruction, nursing care, and human resources. Topics on the handicapped which were rated highly included working with parents, mainstreaming, instructional materials, and language development techniques. A strong interest in several problems related to reading instruction was expressed including motivation, comprehension skills, classroom management, and underachievement. Areas of nursing care in which participants indicated the most interest were nursing care for adults and respiratory nursing care for all age groups. The human resource topics most frequently mentioned were counseling and interviewing techniques with parents and children, child abuse, single parent families, and foster parenting.

The results of these summer workshop deliveries indicate that workshops are an effective way to deliver needed series on topics of interest. AESP plans to continue this programming format in the future.